DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 168 CG 013 769

AUTHOR Erpenbach, William J.; Perrone, Philip A.
TITLE The Wisconsin Alternative School Counselor Preparation Program: An Evaluation.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.
REPORT NO WSDPI-Bull-7209
PUB DATE Dec 76
NOTE 89p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Counselor Certification; *Counselors; *Counselor Training; *Educational Alternatives; Elementary Secondary Education; Empathy; Field Experience Programs; *Internship Programs; *Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

A long-standing debate within the school counseling profession concerns requiring previous teaching experience as a prerequisite to certification for school counselors. Advocates of the teaching requirement argue that it is necessary for counselors to understand and empathize with classroom teachers. Opponents, although they agree with a need for school orientation and experience, feel that teaching is not the only valid way to develop these skills. However, until Wisconsin changed its laws in 1968 to permit the substitution of a one-year counseling internship, it was almost impossible to resolve this debate. Nationally, most states still require teaching experience. In contrast, the counseling profession itself is moving toward reducing but not eliminating the requirement, despite the emotional support by many counselors of the requirements. The Wisconsin internship program permitted an empirical study of an alternative to teaching experience. While further study may be required to satisfy "diehard" proponents of teaching experience, the program was a definite success. To aid other states in following the pattern set by Wisconsin in changing certification requirements, the historical background and subsequent state procedures followed in the implementation and development of the internship program may serve as a model. (LS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Wisconsin Alternative School Counselor Preparation Program—An Evaluation

ED176168

William J. Erpenbach
Philip A. Perrone

December 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William Erpenbach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Pupil Services Section, Dr. Richard R. Roth, Director
Division for Instructional Services, Robert C. Van Raalte, Ass't. Sup't.
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction - 126 Langdon Street
Dr. Barbara Thompson, State Superintendent, Madison 53702

CG013769

Bulletin No. 7209

Table of Contents

		Page
	List of Tables	v
	Preface	vii
I.	**To Teach or Not to Teach—An Examination of the Issues**	1
	Introduction	1
	Teaching Experience A Prerequisite of State Education Agencies (SEAs)	2
	The Role of the Federal Education Agency (FEA)	8
	Teaching Experience The Role of Professional Associations and Practitioners	11
	The Arguments For and Against Teaching Experience for School Counselors	15
	Relevant Research on Teaching Experience on Counselor Functioning	19
	In Conclusion	23
II.	**Results in Wisconsin**	27
	Introduction	27
	Comparing Counselors With and Without Teaching Experience	27
	Findings of Three Institutional Evaluations of the Internship Program	39
	Recommendations for Further Research	42
	In Closing	43
III.	**Implementation in Wisconsin—A Possible Model**	45
	Introduction	45

Page

Historical Background 46

Internship Program Development 47

Implementation Obstacles 50

Development of Policies for Internships 52

Monitoring the Internship Program Through Workshops 55

Conclusions 59

Implications for School Counselor Education 61

Appendices 65

Appendix A 67

Appendix B 69

List of References 71

List of Tables

Page

1. Total Internships, By Institution, Completed During the Period 1968-69 Through 1972-73 29
2. School Districts Employing Intern Counselors and Buildings Served From 1968-69 Through 1972-73 29
3. Number and Percentage of Male and Female ICs and TCs 30
4. Distribution and Mean Ages of ICs and TCs at Initiation of Counselor Education Studies 32
5. Undergraduate Majors of the ICs and TCs by Number, Percentage and Field 32
6. Rank Order of Undergraduate Majors of ICs and TCs by Number and Percentage 34
7. Undergraduate Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of the ICs and TCs 35
8. Graduate Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of the ICs and TCs 36
9. Distribution and Percentages of Grades Received in Practicum by ICs and TCs 37
10. Present Employment Status of ICs and TCs 38

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

William J. Erpenbach, Ph.D., is Supervisor, Counseling and Guidance Services, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin

Philip A. Perrone, Ph.D., is Professor, Department of Counseling and Guidance, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Preface

> . . . no one knows what, if any, effect *not* having had teaching experience has upon the effectiveness of the school counselor; nor does anyone know in any dependable sense whether having *had* experience influences his effectiveness. [Hill, 1968, pp. 25-26].

Debate within the school counseling profession has long existed concerning the requirement of previous teaching experience as a prerequisite to certification for school counselors. Rossberg (1963) calls the issue "one of the major focal points of serious differences of opinion revolving around the education of counselors."

Advocates of teaching experience state that to function successfully a school counselor must be able to understand and have empathy for the role and function of the classroom teacher. They argue that the surest way to gain this empathy and understanding as well as to demonstrate one's "commitment" to education is by first being a classroom teacher. School counselors and their supervisors tend to support the teaching experience requirement in counselor certification. Administrators also favor well-trained counselors who had previous teaching experience. There are other arguments favoring teaching experience for school counselors. However, Grigsby (1970) observes, "None of the arguments for teaching experience is based upon research that indicates the counselor's ability to *counsel* [italics added] is improved by prior teaching experience [p. 2]." The same can apparently be concluded regarding the counselor's ability to perform other guidance functions.

Conversely, there are those who advocate that the teaching experience requirement is not essential for persons who wish to become school counselors. These individuals acknowledge that school counselor preparation should include school orientation and experiences but argue that classroom teaching experience is not the only way to develop needed skills and understandings of the school as a social community. It is the position of these persons that adequate substitute experiences for the classroom teaching experience can be structured for the counselor-in-preparation. On a more pragmatic plane, others have cited a shortage of qualified school counselors as another reason for recruiting counselor trainees from outside of the teaching ranks.

However, in spite of a long and occasionally bitter dialogue within the profession over the teaching experience requirement as a prerequisite to school counseling, it has persisted and survived as a condition of certification in most states. Only within recent years have a few states been willing to consider experimentation directed toward the preparation of school counselors without previous teaching experience and/or who are not prepared as classroom teachers. Most of these states, however, continue to require aspiring school counselors to be eligible for a teaching credential.

While numerous writers have long called for research on this issue, state certification standards for school counselors have tended to restrict serious investigation of the subject. To date, there have been few efforts to study the teaching experience requirements and the matter remains essentially as stated by Hill.

In 1968, major modifications of the school counselor certification standards were implemented in Wisconsin. The changes, for the first time in the state, provided an opportunity to test the teaching preparation and experience requirements for school counselors. Specifically, the plan made it possible to prepare and endorse for certification as school counselors persons who not only lacked previous teaching experience but who were not even eligible for teacher certification. The objective of the experiment was to test assumptions and related inferences about the teaching experience requirement.

This program provided in the state the alternative of a one-year, full-time internship in school counseling under the supervision of a certificated school counselor and the preparing institution in lieu of the prerequisites of teacher preparation and two years of teaching experience. The internship follows the completion of a one-year, full-time, on-campus experience in which the academic requirements for a master's degree in counseling and guidance services are completed. Essentially, the Wisconsin experiment was designed to answer the question, "Does the internship in school counseling provide a satisfactory vehicle for successful entry into the school counseling and guidance services field?"

During the school years, 1967-68 through 1972-73, 115 individuals completed internships in school counseling under this unique alternative to certification. Of these, 88 individuals were not qualified for teacher certification and had no previous teaching experiences. The others had either previous teaching experience or were certificated to teach. The research reported in this monograph is based on studies of the 88 persons in the former group.

Since 1972-73, the scope of the internship alternative has grown in participants, institutions offering the option, and number of new school districts participating. In 1974-75, 52 individuals completed the program; in 1975-76, 52 individuals completed the program; and, in 1976-77, 60 interns are completing the alternative.

This monograph has been prepared to provide an examination of the teacher preparation and experience requirements in school counselor preparation. Also presented is a thorough review and interpretation of selected applicable literature. The results of studying the internship alternative in Wisconsin are reported and a model is offered. Finally, how the alternative was implemented in this state is reported and unresolved questions are discussed. An earlier monograph, *Internships in School Counseling: A Wisconsin Alternative*, provided information on the preparation programs established by the five original participating universities approved by the WDPI to offer internships. Also provided in this publication are data about the interns and cooperating school districts.

Chapter I

To Teach or Not To Teach— An Examination of the Issues

Introduction

The arguments for and against teaching experience as a prerequisite of school counselor certification are examined in this chapter with a critical review of the related literature during the period 1958 to the present. This time restriction is used because the passage of the National Defense Education Act, Titles V-A and V-B (NDEA, V-A and V-B) in 1958 had a marked impact on the number of school counselors employed in the public schools. Prior to 1958 there were few school counselors, far fewer counselor education programs and few states had certification standards for school counselors. Special attention is directed toward a study of literature in the journals of professional associations concerned with school counseling which deal with the arguments for and against requiring teaching experience as a prerequisite to employment as a school counselor.

Selected parts of the review have been identified for critical or anecdotal comment. The basis for critique or comment is the uniqueness of the reviewed material to the arguments for or against requiring teaching experience for school counselors.

Nearly a decade ago, Arbuckle (1967a) observed that a review of the literature showed little empirical data existed to support requiring previous teaching experience for school counselors as a condition of licensure. Eight years later, this conclusion is still substantiated by this literature review. Pro and con articles on this issue have been published by numerous persons. However, these publications tend to be based upon the untested assumptions of the writers. There are few comparisons of counselors with and without teaching experience because certification standards in most states have tended to prohibit employment *in the public schools* of persons as school counselors who do not have one or more years of teaching experience (Arbuckle, 1968; Brown & Peterson, 1968; Dugan, 1961). Many private schools employing school counselors, especially at the secondary level, tend to require that these persons hold or be eligible for state certification. Thus, the private schools have also not provided any appreciable opportunity to test the teaching preparation and experience requirements in school counseling due, in some part, to the constraints of state certification standards.

Brown & Peterson (1968) point out that state certification laws inhibit experimentation with the teaching experience variable in counselor certification, stating

> There can be little doubt that certification standards serve as the single greatest barrier to the only real solution to the dilemma concerning the need for teaching experience. This solution lies in the area of research . . . [p. 19].

Teaching Experience—A Prerequisite of State Education Agencies (SEAs)

The route to a career in school counseling in the public schools of America has traditionally included the completion of a baccalaureate or higher degree leading to a teaching certificate and "successful" teaching for one or more years; this teaching experience requirement varying from state to state throughout the nation (Brewster, 1957; *Duties, standards and qualifications for counselors,* 1949). Hill (1961) describes this process,

In short, in practice, the selection of counselors transpires typically in about these steps:

> First, a teacher becomes interested in guidance work, takes some training and is assigned guidance duties, or an administrator identifies a teacher on his staff whom he regards as potentially a good guidance worker and encourages him (or her) to seek training [p.357].

The teaching preparation and experience prerequisites in state certification are not unique to school counselors. In fact, a tenet of the public schools has been that those professionals employed *in the schools* at levels other than in classroom teaching—principals, curriculum consultants, superintendents, supervisors, etc.—should have each been first "successful" classroom teachers.

White and Forrest (1963) contend that the teaching experience requirement in school counselor certification stems from the close association of guidance services with vocationally oriented businesses during the first decade of this century. At this time, school, business and industrial leaders were concerned about matching the needs of youth (in large urban industrial cities) with the world of work. Thus, vocational guidance became associated with the schools. It logically followed that teachers would provide the guidance. Training programs for the counselors followed, the counselors coming from the teaching ranks, and the teaching experience requirement was never really questioned (p.340).

Swan (1965) argues that the teaching experience requirement developed as a matter of expediency in her observation that following World War II the demand

for counselors far exceeded the supply. It seemed better to seek candidates for counseling jobs who had at least completed a baccalaureate degree urging them to meet the graduate requirements for counselor certification as opposed to the time consuming process of educating counselors in a four year undergraduate program and following this with at least a year of graduate study. It seemed natural that teachers would be recruited to meet the need for counselors (p. 72).

Also, Arbuckle (1961) observes that,

> Many state departments of education appear to believe that the counselor is really a teacher, and certification carries with it the requirement of teaching experience—the assumption being that teaching experience somehow makes one a better school counselor [p. 54].

In an early study of selected characteristics of school counselor certification practices in the United States, McCully (1961) reported these summary findings:

> (3) Many states require a specified amount of teaching experience and a number require experience other than teaching for the entry certificate. This is tantamount to denying that programs of formal counselor education are sufficient to develop the professional competence needed by school counselors.
>
> (4) Most of the states make counselor certification contingent upon prior teacher certification. This institutional folkway pyramids on counselor certification all the vagaries and problems of teacher certification which currently is, and since 1906 has been, described by informed persons as chaotic . . . . Furthermore, it impinges on the amount of formal professional counselor preparation which realistically can be required of the school counselor [p. 8].

Rossberg (1963) calls existing state certification standards one of two major obstacles to experimentation with the teaching requirements for school counselors. This obstacle, he asserts, may not be easily disposed of (p. 124). Weitz (1958) reporting a nationwide survey of counselor employment policies and practices states that state directors of guidance (SEA guidance supervisors) tended to be quite parochial in their defense of the teaching experience requirement for school counselors; a position which does not appear markedly changed in 1975. Isaksen (1967) takes a stance similar to that of Rossberg (1963) stating,

> In view of the fact that most states require teacher training and teaching experience as a prerequisite for certification as a school counselor, it is difficult to acquire empirical evidence to support or deny the claims that this is desirable or necessary. School counselors who have not met these prerequisites are so scarce in the field that it is difficult to demonstrate that they might be as successful as school counselors who have met these prerequisites [p. 82].

Johnson (V.B., 1962), a former state supervisor for guidance services, was an early, strong advocate of teaching experience for counselors. Although eventually

creating an apparently unintentional dichotomous approach favoring teaching experience for the *guidance worker* and willing to consider not requiring teaching experience for a "counselor," he argued that counselor certification requirements must be applied to everyone. Johnson's rather irrational defense of teaching experience for counselors suggests that no one can be trusted to judge whether a substitute vocational experience would have been "successful" so we must require teaching experience for all *guidance workers* including "counselors" (pp. 33-34).

Noble (1965) suggests that the two-year graduate program in counselor certification called for in the 1964 statement, "Standards for Counselor Education in the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors," is needed only because state certification makes it necessary for a prospective counselor to first prepare as a classroom teacher. Further, Noble argues that the additional year of graduate study is necessary to provide the counselor candidate with a grounding in psychology, sociology and other areas which he failed to get as an undergraduate because of his teacher education coursework (p. 160).

Herr (1971), in a national study of SEA guidance responsibilities, surveyed school counselors, counselor educators and state guidance supervisors finding that 80% or more of his respondents agreed that the development of certification requirements for school counselors in all educational settings (grades K through 12) is an appropriate responsibility of the SEA (p. 213). Herr's findings are based on a response from 156 (44.7%) counselor educators, 510 (51%) school counselors and 113 state guidance supervisors from 37 states.

At least one writer has called for national certification of school counselors. Recognizing that many will argue regarding preparation standards, Keppers (1965) cites two changes which need to be made in counselor certification; work experience (outside of education) and teaching experience requirements. The former he dismisses lightly as having already been excluded from credentials in many states and easily eliminated as a specific item in the others (p. 205). The advent of career education has rekindled interest in work experience requirements for counselor certification. Keppers differentiates between certification requirements and employment conditions when he states, "If school administrators wish to include this requirement, fine. In fact, they may wish to impose other standards as well [pp. 205-206]."

The role of the SEA in certification. State education agencies (SEAs) have played a critical role in initiating and preserving the teaching preparation and experience requirements as part of school counselor certification. To begin with, individuals wishing to be employed professionally in the public elementary and secondary school must meet existing preparation standards and hold such certification as required by the state. Secondly, certification standards as administrated by SEAs also tend to affect the admissions standards and curricula of undergraduate as well as graduate preparation programs. Additionally, education by Constitution is a state function, and states tend to exercise this authority through extensive regulatory power in the control of the certification process. Hiring

someone as a counselor who does not have teaching experience which may be required for certification can, as Kehas (1970) notes, severely penalize a school district in that the district may be declared ineligible for state or federal support (p. 65).

The credentialing function of the SEA is typified by the procedure in Wisconsin. Authority is found in these statutes:

> *115.28 General duties.* The state superintendent shall:
>
> (7) LICENSING AND CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS. (a) License or certify all teachers for the public schools of the state, make rules and prescribe standards of attainment for the examination, licensing and certification of teachers within the limits prescribed in ss. 118.19(2) and (3), 118.195 and 118.196, file in his [her] office all papers relating to state teachers' licenses and certificates and register each such license or certificate [Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1969].
>
> *118.19 Teacher certificates and licenses.* (1) Any person seeking to teach in a public school or in a school or institution operated by a county or the state shall first procure a certificate or license from the department [of public instruction] [Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1969].

The implications for preparation programs at the university level in the state is reflected in this statement:

> Wisconsin, like most other states, grants certification on the basis of the applicant's having completed a program approved by the state education agency. At least once every four years, each of the state's teacher training institutions . . . is visited by a team of evaluators. Every preparation leading to certification is reviewed and assigned an approval status. Since the Department establishes minimum standards for teaching . . .college and university programs, in order to obtain approval, must at least meet the minimum standards . . . [Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1972].

To carry out its authority in the certification process, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) has established a procedure for the proposal of new or modification of existing certification standards. In this, the WDPI proceeds much like other state education agencies. Essentially, all modifications of standards are submitted initially to the State Superintendent's Advisory Committee for Teacher Education and Certification.

Upon hearing the particular certification proposal, the committee may take one of several courses of action. It may (a) recommend qualified or unqualified adoption to the State Superintendent; (b) recommend further study of the proposal; (c) reject part or all of the proposal; or, (d) take no action. In cases where favorable action is not recommended to the State Superintendent, the proponents may make a direct appeal to the State Superintendent for further consideration. In all instances, it is the decision of the State Superintendent to continue or terminate the proposed course of action regarding the certification standards.

If the State Superintendent decides to consider further a given change in the certification code, a series of public hearings are scheduled on the matter. The testimony of witnesses appearing at these hearings is then summarized and reported to the State Superintendent as the next step. It then becomes the decision of the State Superintendent to adopt, reject, or modify the proposal. Once adopted, the modifications become part of the state's certification code. This process, therefore, provides ample opportunity for various groups or individuals to exercise substantial influence over the nature of standards which are established for the certification of practitioners.

SEA certification standards changing. During the late 1960's, many state education agencies began to reconsider the requirements of teaching preparation and experience for the certification of all persons who would serve as practicing school counselors (Wittmer & Lister, 1973). The level of this activity is reflected in Boller's (1972) recent survey of the 50 state education agencies to ascertain current teaching experience requirements for school counselor certification including proposed changes, if any, being planned in these requirements. Forty-eight states responded to the survey questionnaire. The results of the survey show that 42 (86%) states currently require teaching experience for school counselor certification. Of these states, however, 14 (26%) accept an alternative to the teaching experience, i.e., an internship in a school setting. Seven states (14%) have no specific requirements for teaching experience for school counselors. The eighteen states still requiring teaching experience are presently considering changes toward eliminating or reducing the requirement (p. 389). Boller concludes,

> There does seem to be evidence that certification policies for counselors, with regard to teaching background and experience, are changing. This change is slowly catching on and is based most often on the *substitution* of one type of school experience for another [p. 391].

The findings of Boller (1972) can be compared to those of Brewster (1957), Dudley & Ruff (1970), and Lloyd (1962) in noting the development of state certification standards for school counselors. Brewster (1957) reported that 30 of the then 48 states required counselor certification for those individuals assigned part- or full-time responsibility as school counselors and six states had optional certification standards. One state, Minnesota, was reported as having both mandatory and optional counselor certification requirements. However, a review of the Minnesota standards suggests that these were *not* optional. The District of Columbia and Hawaii also reported mandatory counselor certification standards. At this time, all states and territories with either mandatory or optional counselor certification requirements, except one (New York), required either eligibility for an elementary or secondary school teaching credential or teaching experience or both. New York's standards allowed for equivalent experiences to be substituted for any teaching experience or licensure requirements. At least two years of teaching

experience was the most common requirement as a prerequisite to counselor certification (13 of 30 states and Hawaii).

Dudley & Ruff (1970) found that every state, with the exception of Michigan, had certification requirements. Michigan has passed enabling legislation and it was expected that school counselor certification standards would be in effect by July 1, 1971 (p. 304). The results of this study indicate that "six states [which states are not clearly designated] do not have a specified teaching requirement while three states will accept substitutes for teaching experience. All other states require at least one year of teaching prior to certification [p. 305]."

Lloyd (1962) investigated the nature of existing counselor certification in each state and then obtained the reactions of counselors and counselor-trainers to the certification codes. He found that 34 (68%) states had mandatory school counselor certification (p. 792) and that all required teaching certificates for school counselors (p. 793) while four of these states did not require previous teaching experience for counselors (pp. 793-794).

The picture is less clear regarding certification standards for the school counseling profession's newest area—elementary school counselors. Van Hoose & Vafakas (1968) investigated selected aspects of counseling and guidance services in the 50 states and four American territories. A 100% response was achieved. Of the 14 states reporting certification standards *for elementary school counseling,* all required elementary school teaching experience (p. 538). Wehrly (1970) notes that preparation programs for elementary school counselors do not offer topics such as organization of the elementary school and elementary school curriculum (or other courses concerning the school setting) because these courses are included in teacher preparation programs. Thus, she feels the colleges and universities help to perpetuate the teaching experience prerequisite to counselor preparation. Wehrly's conclusions are based on a survey of 308 institutions reporting in 1968 to be preparing elementary school counselors.

Since Boller's (1972) study, three more states have reported dropping the teaching experience requirement for school counselors. Connecticut has adopted new certification standards for school counselors which provide "the opportunity for those who have not had teacher training to substitute a one-year internship for the three year teaching experience requirement [*ASCA Newsletter,* 1973, p. 4]." In Massachusetts, the state school counselors' association's committee on certification worked with the state education agency to eliminate the teaching experience requirement for school counselor certification in that state (personal communication from Robert C. Norton, January 19, 1973). In 1971, South Carolina created an undergraduate training program for school counselors and altered its existing standards for school counselor certification. The state's previous counselor certification requirements included two years of teaching experience and graduate preparation in guidance. As reported in the *APGA Guidepost* article, "New Directions in Counselor Education" (1971), "The new undergraduate program calls for a full-time, one-term internship, directed by a full-time, certified

counselor in his school setting [p. 2]." This undergraduate program in counseling and guidance does not require preparation for teaching. The South Carolina Master of Arts level preparation program will be maintained but will also provide for a supervised practicum/internship to replace the two-year teaching experience requirement. It should also be noted that these changes in South Carolina occured not because of a specific interest in testing the teaching experience requirement for school counselors but because "not enough students were choosing counseling as a vocation to meet the demands of the public schools [p. 2]."

The influence of the state education agency upon counselor certification standards has not abated. As Arbuckle (1968) notes,

> the legal determination of what is required to educate a counselor continues to be controlled by state departments of education, and thus in the United States there continues to be 50 versions of what is necessary to educate an individual so that he might be 'certified' to be a counselor . . . [p. 246].

Wrenn (1965) believes that SEAs continue to exert too much influence over counselor preparation and certification. Calling attention to the growing gap between certification standards for counselors and the advancement of counseling practices and counselor education, he states that certification standards characteristically lag behind the best thinking in any profession (p. 64). Shertzer & Stone (1966) concur, adding:

> State certification is seen as providing a floor of minimum standards for educating school counselors. State requirements necessarily follow professional standards and often lag some ten to fifteen years behind new training concepts and developments [p. 97].

Dilley (1972c) summarizes the situation well in his statement:

> Perhaps the principal reason why 42 states still require or prefer teaching experience for counselor certification . . . is that the educational establishment believes teaching experience is necessary [p. 132].

The Role of the Federal Education Agency (FEA)

The development of certification standards at the state level, however, is frequently influenced by sources external to the SEA (i.e., professional associations, legislative mandate, federal aid to education). In the initiation of school counselor certification standards in the states the Federal Education Agency (FEA), the U. S. Office of Education (USOE), exerted substantial influence in two ways; especially in perpetuating the teaching experience requirement.

First, the USOE and the National Association of State Supervisors of Guidance Services and Counselor Trainers (NAGSCT)—now the Association for Counselor

Education and Supervision (ACES)—collaborated at their Eighth National Conference in 1949 in the development of a model statement for state standards for the preparation and certification of school counselors. This model statement, reported in the bulletin, *Duties, Standards and Qualifications for Counselors* (1949), was developed at a time when few, if any, states had certification standards in force for school counselors. Regarding the education of the counselor, NAGSCT stated,

> A counselor must have a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution and must meet fully the regular State educational requirements for a teacher's certificate valid for the grade level in which the counselor is employed [p. 3].

Regarding experiences which an individual should have prior to becoming a school counselor, the report states, "The practicing counselor must have had at least two years of successful teaching or counseling experience . . . [p. 4]." Just how one obtains two years of "counseling experience" when teacher preparation and prior teaching experience are prerequisite to counselor certification is not treated in the NAGSCT statement. Stewart, Norem, Polmantier & Saum (1958) observe, "In establishing requirements [for counselor certification] many states have taken the recommendations of the 8th National Conference of NAGSCT verbata [p. 162]." Such does indeed seem to be the case when one reviews existing certification standards for counselors in the various states.

In the second instance, the U.S. Office of Education exerted considerable influence in maintaining teaching experience in state counselor certification codes in the development and promulgation of policies and procedures pertaining to the National Defense Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes Program as authorized by the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. Specifically, NDEA, Title V-B provided an opportunity for the Commissioner of Education to contract with colleges and universities "for the purpose of improving the qualifications of personnel engaged in counseling and guidance of students in secondary schools, or of teachers in secondary schools preparing to engage in such counseling and guidance [Office of Education, 1959, p. 2]."

NDEA, Title V-B was enacted at a time of extensive debate among leaders in the counseling and guidance services profession concerning the teaching experience requirement for school counselors. The American Personnel and Guidance Association's (APGA) Committee on Counselor Preparation in a project authorized at the Association's 1956 Convention had just reported its recommendations for minimum standards for the preparation of counselors (APGA, 1958). Recognizing that, "Future research may indicate that some kinds of work experience [including teaching experience] are actually detrimental [p. 163] . . ." to the counseling function, the Committee suggested that "other kinds of experience, such as leisure time and volunteer activities, might provide the same skills and understanding which supposedly result from employment. This entire

range of problems needs careful study [p. 163]." It is interesting to note that while the Committee did acknowledge that teaching experience may not be necessary for school counselors and did insinuate that it may indeed be undesirable, it did not specifically recommend that the teaching experience requirement be eliminated in school counselor preparation and certification. At this time, APGA seemed to be speaking predominately in behalf of counselor educators, yet it was and is the professional association for school counselors as well as their supervisors and educators. The APGA position was obviously not strong enough at that time to influence the U. S. Office of Education in the development of the policies for the implementation of the provisions of NDEA, Title V-B.

With the existence of the NAGSCT model for counselor certification (which had been developed primarily due to USOE support) and the apparent heavy reliance on state supervisors of guidance services for assistance in developing the policies and procedures for the training institutes, it is not surprising in the final analysis that teaching experience continued as a primary prerequisite in school counselor preparation. The participants in the NDEA, Title V-B institutes simply had to be practicing school counselors (and therefore, previously classroom teachers) or *secondary school* teachers wishing to become school counselors. Further, institutions wishing to conduct institutes had to give assurance to the USOE concerning

> the types of evidence and methods which would be used to ensure that only legally eligible persons would be admitted and that enrollees would have opportunity to perform counseling and guidance responsibilities, commensurate with their professional competence, when they returned to their secondary schools [Office of Education, 1959, p. 6].

In other words, the NDEA, Title V-B program could have provided an early research opportunity concerning the teaching experience variable in school counselor certification. The institutes came at a time when many states did not have certification standards for counselors. Yet, the language of the law as administered through the USOE served to ensure that teaching experience would continue to be required for counselors in the schools. This language also remained intact through several amendments to the original Act of 1958; these amendments occuring through 1968 and eventually including the preparation of counselors for the elementary school setting.

While many writers (e.g., Dugan, 1960; Klopf & Cohen, 1962) reported on the impact which the NDEA, Title V-B institutes had on counselor education, especially in the early 1960's, none advocated that the policies and procedures governing the conduct of institutes be amended to provide for experimentation with the teaching experience variable in counselor preparation. Instead, the writers appear concerned in the main with university staff, facilities and didactic technique. Thus, the Federal Education Agency provided substantive support to the further

entrenchment of teaching experience in counselor certification; support which apparently went unchallenged.

The emphasis on educational background maintained in the NDEA, Title V-B program is also found in the language of NDEA, Title V-A. This latter program made available (from 1958 through 1970) funds to local education agencies, through the SEAs, for the development of school counseling, guidance and testing programs. In order for public school districts to participate in the NDEA, Title V-A program, they had to give assurance that the school counselors employed "were educators and met the standards for counselor preparation as indicated in the SEA plan [personal communication from Donald Twiford, December 7, 1973]."

Teaching Experience—The Role of Professional Associations and Practitioners

It has only been in recent years that a few states have provided a mechanism in their certification standards to test whether or not teaching experience is necessary for success in school counseling. The role and opinions of professional associations; their committees; individuals interested in the work of school counselors or involved in the preparation, certification, or supervision of counselors; and counselors themselves, however, seem to stand in the way of any extensive effort to thoroughly examine and research the issue. This is because there is no appreciable concensus between these groups regarding whether or not school counselors should have first been prepared and then experienced as classroom teachers. Lister and Northrup (1970) observe that

> . . .[while] there is a national trend toward removing the teaching requirement or providing for substitute experiences, counselor educators remain divided on the issue; practicing counselors strongly favor the teaching experience requirements; and school superintendents and principals almost universally favor the requirement. . .[p. 8].

The primary groups involved in this are the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) and two of APGA's divisions—the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). ACES comprises both the state supervisors of guidance services, a very influential group in determining counselor certification standards, and the counselor educators themselves. Often, these three bodies, through commissions and their members individually and collectively, are in disagreement over the teaching prerequisite for counselors; individual members favoring teaching experience and committees of the associations dealing with standards and preparation favoring research on the issue and implicitly the elimination of teaching experience as a condition of certification for *all* school counselors.

In a survey of school counselor leaders nationally (Winfrey, 1962) regarding the teaching experience requirement for counselors, 62 (50%) of the respondents favored allowing a few persons to be certified as school counselors provided they had a supervised internship in a school setting. Only 30% of the respondents disagreed with this (p. 30). This apparent support by counselors for an alternate route to the teaching experience requirement for counselors in state certification programs can be, however, deceiving. For example, at the time of the Winfrey study, the Northern California Guidance Association passed the following resolution regarding teaching experience for school counselors:

> Be it resolved that two years of successful teaching experience or one year plus a year of supervised field experience in pupil personnel work, be required for selection as a school counselor [California resolutions, 1962].

It should be noted that by 1965, California no longer required teaching experience for all persons wishing to become school counselors; an alternate route was provided which included extensive field experiences.

Adding fuel to the fire that counselors who have been teachers tend to support the teaching experience requirements, Hutson (1962B) analyzed the work of R.D. Cox (1945, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Pennsylvania) who studied a group of 100 selected secondary school counselors identified as "best" in a screening process. The findings of the Cox study includes the comment, "Support for the proposition that the counselor should have a background of teacher education and teaching experience is overwhelming [p. 138]." It seems worthwhile to note that the group of 100 counselors studied included 95 who came to their counseling positions through teaching. The findings of Cox are corroborated by those of Norris (1960) in a later study of 379 persons completing a master's degree in counseling and guidance at Michigan State University from 1946 through 1958.

Lloyd (1962) mailed a questionnaire on attitudes toward counselor certification to a random sample of 50% of the members of the National Association of Guidance Supervisors and Counselor Trainers (now ACES) and 10% of the members of ASCA in the 34 states having mandatory counselor certification in 1962. Usable returns were received from 95 (70%) NAGSCT members and 123 (70%) ASCA members. He found that, "An overwhelming majority of the members of both ASCA [93%] and NAGSCT [85%] agreed with existing state regulations requiring counselors to obtain a teaching certificate [p. 793]." The only area of mild disagreement appears to be over how much teaching experience is necessary. Only 3% of the responding ASCA members would have been willing to forego an actual teaching experience requirement for counselors. Lloyd concludes that when making recommendations to states considering the adoption or revision of counselor certification regulations, it is important to note that this recommendation is one of the first to tie the teaching experience requisite to the grade levels at which

counselors work. "A teaching certificate valid for the level (elementary, junior high, or high school) on which the counselor is functioning, should be required [p. 797]."

The position of the Northern California Guidance Association (1962), the findings of Cox (1945) reported by Hutson (1962) and those of Lloyd (1962) are practically identical to that of school counselors responding to a recent survey of members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). The ASCA Delegate Assembly (the official policy making body of the Association) appointed a special committee in 1972 to determine how school counselors feel about their training and certification standards (ASCA, 1973). An opinionnaire was mailed to 1,203 ASCA members (10% of the Association's, May, 1972, membership) based on every tenth ASCA member in each state. Usable returns were received from 552 (46%) individuals (p. 2). Responses were summarized by five geographic regions across the United States and for the nation as a whole. Regarding certification standards, only 25% of the respondents felt that teaching experience should not be a prerequisite to counselor certification. Thirteen percent favored at least one year of teaching experience, 29% favored at least two years and 30% favored at least three years.

On the other hand, Lawlor (1968) reports an earlier ASCA membership study involving a 20% sample of the ASCA membership during 1966-67. She found that most practicing counselors (82.5% of the respondents) in the United States come from the ranks of the teaching profession (p. 4). What types of schools they worked in (private or public) and whether they were employed in states without school counselor certification standards were not reported. Lawlor (1968) concluded, in behalf of the ASCA sponsored survey,

> the requirement of successful teaching experience before one can gain counseling status is still very much with us. We need to be busy finding out whether such a thing is necessary. The requirement makes our entrance older, and it causes counselors to train for other than counseling in undergraduate preparation, thus reducing their commitment to counseling [p. 4].

Another ASCA committee, appointed originally in 1957, was charged to (a) develop a rationale, (b) develop a statement of scope and function and (c) raise pertinent issues related to the qualifications for and preparation of elementary school counselors (Meeks, 1967, p. 163). Although not reporting until almost ten years later, this committee was one of the pioneers in examining the preparation standards and work of counselors at the elementary school level. Regarding the preparation of elementary school counselors, Meeks (1967) notes:

> Since the work of the counselor is primarily concerned with the child as a learner in an educational setting, the counselor must be thoroughly cognizant of both the learning process and the classroom situation. This has generally been interpreted as a mandate for requiring teaching experience as a basis for certification as a counselor [p. 186].

She also reports that the committee suggests research on whether or not teaching experience is the only acceptable approach to guidance (p. 186). The fact that this statement comes approximately ten years after this particular ASCA committee began its deliberations leaves one free only to speculate as to whether this position reflects a new and changed position on the issue of prior teaching experience for all school counselors; or, if it was indeed a revolutionary step well ahead of its time.

Nissman & Stamm (1970), in an essay on a rationale for counselors in the elementary school, make this comment illustrative of the lack of consensus between practitioners and committees such as that chaired by Meeks (1967):

> The success of the elementary school counselor is greatly dependent upon his training. He [she] needs to be familiar with the normal growth and development of the primary years as well as familiar with the most fundamental guidance techniques for working with the very young. He [she] should have been an elementary teacher to be familiar with the curriculum of the elementary school [p. 166].

The disparity of positions between the calls for experimentation by the ASCA committees reported by Taylor (1968) and Meeks (1967) and the continued emphasis on teaching experience in counselor certification illustrated by the Northern California Guidance Association (1962), the ASCA (1973) findings, the analysis by Hutson (1962), and Lloyd's (1962) study serve to highlight the lack of unanimity concerning this issue even within the school counseling ranks. While individual members (in large numbers) of the profession seem to favor teaching experience as a condition of counselor certification, many school counselor association committees directed to study the involved issues tend to call for research and experimentation of the teaching experience variable.

In addition to the above professional association activity concerning preparation and certification standards for school counselors, both the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) have directed committees and commissions to work on this subject. In 1961, an APGA Committee (APGA, 1961) issued the first policy statement on the preparation of school counselors. In this statement, the Special Committee for the Preparation of the APGA Policy Statement on Counselor Education argues that since the counselor functions in the school, he or she must understand the school as an instrument of society (p. 404). The committee acknowledges that teaching experience may provide this knowledge and familiarity but other experiences are also suitable and acceptable (p. 404). The report also states that those counselors in preparation who have not had prior school experience (i.e., teaching) should have a supervised internship of at least one semester in the schools (p. 406). This policy was reviewed and revised by two succeeding committees (APGA, 1963; APGA, 1964) without any further treatment of the teaching experience issue for school counselors.

In 1967, ACES published their revised version of standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors (ACES, 1967). Regarding the selection of

candidates to become secondary school counselors, the standards call for admission of persons from fields other than education as well as those who have demonstrated superior competence as teachers (p. 102). Clearly, most of those who have gone through the "initiation rites" are unwilling to alter the fraternal admission policies.

The Arguments For and Against Teaching Experience for School Counselors

The arguments for and against prior teaching experience as an entry requirement for school counseling have been numerous and varied; and, almost always based on the assumptions of the proponents rather than on research and empirical evidence. Arbuckle (1967a) states, "there is no empirical evidence to indicate that being a teacher makes one a more effective counselor [p. 533]." Several writers (Boller, 1970-71; Brown & Peterson, 1968; Hill, 1961, 1968; Lister, 1969; and Shertzer & Stone, 1966, 1968) have listed reasons—beyond the influences of state education agencies, the federal education agency, and professional associations—for and against requiring counselors to have teaching experience.

These reasons and others range from the very rational through those based principally upon emotion (Shertzer & Stone, 1968, p. 583) to the very irrational. The most startling observation is, however, that the review of the literature and an examination of the issues involved reveal *no* significant evidence to support any of the arguments for teaching experience as a necessary prerequisite to successful performance as a school counselor. Stated another way, it is doubtful that a lack of teaching experience can be used to predict that one would be ineffective in the school counseling and guidance role.

A summation of the issues. Most of the issues in the teaching experience prerequisite for school counselors, beyond the influence of state or federal education agencies and professional associations, are ably summarized by Shertzer & Stone (1966) as:

Teaching experience and/or teacher preparation is necessary because:

- *1. Teaching experience provides counselors with the necessary insight into the school as a social institution.
- *2. Teaching experience gives counselors an understanding and appreciation of teachers, their point of view, and issues and problems involved in classroom instruction. [See also Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; Zerface & Cox, 1971; Dugan, 1960; and Bixler, 1963.]
- *3. Teaching experience has enabled counselors to observe pupils in a classroom setting, to be aware of their needs in such settings, and to understand the conditions which facilitate and inhibit learning.
- *4. It serves as a common facilitating experience between counselors and teachers. Counselors who have had teaching experience and teacher preparation are more

likely to be accepted by teachers and will be better able to relate to them. Without this shared ingredient, counselors may be viewed suspiciously and distrustfully by teachers.

5. Requiring teaching experience gives the individual the perspective needed to decide the area of specialization (teaching, counseling, administration) he wishes to enter in graduate work.
6. Most school administrators will not employ counselors who do not have teaching experience. [Lister (1969) expands this to include the majority of educators outside of the counseling and guidance profession (p. 40).] [See also Fredrickson & Pippert, 1964; McDougall & Reitan, 1963; Meeks, 1967; Hopper, Brown & Pfister, 1970; Dilley, 1972c; Hoyt, 1962; Lister, 1969; McCreary & Miller, 1966; Moore, 1961; Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; Weitz, 1958; Zerface & Cox, 1971; Peterson & Brown, 1968; Sexton, 1965; Kehas, 1970; Paulson, 1967; and Peters & Thompson, 1968.]
7. If teacher preparation were not required, individuals from other disciplines would rush into the field. Advisers to students in other disciplines might use school counseling as a dumping ground for inferior, marginal candidates. [See also Johnson, V. B., 1962 and Wittmer & Lister, 1973.]
8. Teacher preparation and teaching experience is, in reality, an expression of the individual's prior commitment to public-school education. [See also Hoyt, 1961; Miller, 1962; Lawlor, 1968; Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; and Stewart, 1961.]

• [See also Hoyt, 1961, 1962; Hutson, 1964; Hudson, 1961; Pierson, 1954; Tooker, 1957; Mathewson, 1962; Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; Venn, 1964, 1967; Wittmer & Lister, 1973.]

Teaching experience and teacher preparation is unnecessary because:

1. Counseling and teaching are fundamentally different activities. Little that is learned in teaching transfers meaningfully the counseling relationship. [See also Arbuckle, 1961, 1967; Blocher, 1966; Carson, 1971; Humes, 1971; Kehas, 1970; Kehas & Morse, 1971; Martinson & Winborn, 1964; Nugent, 1966; Moore, 1961; Johnson, 1962; McCully, 1961; and Rochester & Cottingham, 1966.]
2. Extended teaching experience frequently results in undesirable, authoritarian and patronizing attitudes and outlooks toward children that conflict with the basic attitudes essential in counseling. [See also Arbuckle, 1961; APGA, 1958; Barry & Wolf, 1962; Farwell, 1962; Aubrey, 1969; Campbell, 1962; Gazda, et al, 1967; Grigsby, 1970; Kehas & Morse, 1970, 1971; Mazer et al, 1965; Merrill, Lister & Antenen, 1968; Olsen, 1963; Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; Stewart, et al, 1958; Swan, 1965; Whetstone, 1965; Wittmer & Lister, 1973; Wittmer & Webster, 1969; and Carroll & Tyson, 1969.]
3. Present-day counselors (with teaching experience) have generally failed to establish a satisfactory relationship with teachers; consequently, such a relationship is most likely dependent upon variables other than teaching experience per se. [See also Stewart, 1961 and Lawlor, 1968.]
4. An increasing number of counselors must be sought in the years ahead. The nation-wide shortage of school counselors reflects the fact that the teaching profession as a source of supply for counselors is inadequate. The availability of recruits for the teaching profession in light of population increase is itself questionable. [See also Brown & Peterson, 1968; Dugan, 1961; Hoyt, 1962; Hudson, 1961; Hobbs, 1958; Pedone, 1971; Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; Stewart, 1961; Weitz, 1958; Myrick, 1973; Kobrin, 1973; Hays, 1973; Maynard, 1973; and Woody, 1973.]
5. Since teaching as a profession has failed to attract the best minds and the most able individuals, opening school counseling to other disciplines provides a better source of

supply for able and capable candidates. [See also Cohen, 1961; Dugan, 1961, 1963; Hobbs, 1958; Hoyt, 1962; Lloyd-Jones, 1962; Noble, 1968; Stewart, 1961; and Thompson, 1965.]

6. A more effective way to provide the counselor with an understanding of the school environment, the wide range of student and teacher problems, and the understanding needed to relate to school personnel is through guidance internship experience, which is uniquely structured and carefully directed, supervised, and evaluated. [See also APA, 1962; Boller, 1970-71, 1972; APGA, 1961; Dilley, 1972c; Eckerson & Smith, 1966; Farwell, 1962; Kehas & Morse, 1971; Lister & Northrup, 1970; Noble, 1965; Nugent, 1966; O'Brien, Bailey & Fitzgerald, 1966; Peterson & Brown, 1968; Port Chester Public Schools, 1969; Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; Ricker, 1969; Trow, 1961; and Wilson, 1969.]
7. The practice of mandating four years of undergraduate teacher preparation; two, three, or more years of teaching experience; and two years of counselor preparation before actual admission to school counseling is unrealistic, considering the financial rewards received by practicing school counselors. Ways to shorten pre-service time must be found if able counselors are to be attracted and retained in the field. [See also Arbuckle, 1967a, 1967b; APGA, 1958; Farwell, 1961; Hoyt, 1961; Humes, 1970; Huff, 1965; Isaksen, 1967; Lawlor, 1968; Rochester & Cottingham, 1966; Stewart, et al, 1958; Swan, 1965; Venn, 1967; and Warnath, 1973.]

Other arguments favoring teaching experience. Swan (1965), in discussing another argument for the teaching experience requirement, notes that it serves to postpone the time when one becomes a counselor and thus assures more "maturity" for those who enter counseling; "maturity" being an assumed desirable trait of counselors. Swan does note that one does not achieve maturity through age alone in her examination and plea for the elimination of the teaching prerequisite for school counselors. Concerning this issue, Hutson (1963), in a discussion of his views on counselor preparation concludes that

> . . . *maturity* and *experience* are necessary to winning the confidence and respect of co-workers in the school. These are foundational qualifications that the 22 year old M.S. in psychology does not have. The teaching apprenticeship is the best means by which the counselor can acquire them [p. 25].

Rochester and Cottingham (1966) surveyed 397 randomly selected names listed in the *Directory of Counselor Educators* to investigate the thinking of counselor educators on the necessity and length of teaching experience which might be required for school counselors and the reasons for their positions on these viewpoints (p. 176). Their results are based on a response from 231 (60%) counselor educators representing 47 of the 50 states. The findings of Rochester and Cottingham add these arguments for favoring teaching experience for school counselors:

> The counselor often helps students through non-counseling contacts; his broader function in the school community is more easily perceived and accomplished if he has taught.
>
> Counselors need the practical experience of teaching to fully understand adolescents, their parents and the community implications of school situations; this experience tends to keep their counseling from being too theoretically based. . . .

> It is undesirable to dichotomize teaching and counseling; this takes away the guidance function of the classroom teacher....
>
> Teaching experience is required for state certification in guidance.
>
> Teaching has proven to be a good source of counselors to date; potential counselors can be identified from the ranks of good teachers through observation and evaluation [p. 180].

Other arguments against the requirement. Regarding the arguments against teaching experience, Shertzer & Stone (1968) add, "Experienced counselor educators frequently cite the difficulties encountered in altering teaching-oriented attitudes which are detrimental to counseling [p. 583]."

Wittmer and Lister (1973), reporting on a survey of school counselors in Florida, add the following arguments (based on their research findings) against the teaching experience requirement:

> Time spent in teaching and in perparation for teaching would be better spent in preparation for counseling and in obtaining experience in counseling....
>
> Personal qualities are more important than experience or training [see also Rochester & Cottingham, 1966]....
>
> The teaching background makes it difficult for the counselor to be perceived as a specialist in human behavior [pp. 89-90].

Dugan (1960), discussing the impact of the first year of the NDEA, Title V-B Institutes program, raises another of the arguments against the teaching experience requirements in school counselor certification when he observes that,

> . . . a significant gap exists in the professional preparation of . . . counselors who rise from the ranks of teaching. Basically, this gap is in the foundations of psychological preparation which undergirds the real understanding of human behavior [p. 37].

Brown and Peterson (1968) also state that teacher training seriously limits undergraduate involvement in psychology. Havens (1972) makes a similar argument. Studies by Norris (1960) and Winkler (1966) have shown that few teacher experienced counselors have undergraduate backgrounds in psychology (14% of 255 individuals studied in the former case and 4% of 415 individuals in the latter). Swann (1963) in a study of the counselor's changing roles states that there is growing support for more psychology and sociology and less emphasis on education courses for counselors-in-preparation (p. 99).

A comment on the arguments. A decade ago, Rossberg (1963), reviewed the positions for and against teaching experience as a prerequisite of school counselor certification. His comments regarding the pro and con sides of this issue are still appropo.

Regarding those favoring teaching experience for counselors, Rossberg states,

> The proponents of this point of view are convinced that it is necessary to be an integrated part of the social institution of the school to successfully aid in the implementation of

> educational objectives. . . . The only manner in which such insights may be developed, according to proponents . . . is through the actual experiences of teaching. If the latter were demonstrated, there would be no argument [p. 122].

Regarding the arguments against teaching experience, Rossberg observes

> . . . We have supported this contention (the teaching requirement) for so long that many of us have assumed that its origins can be traced to some act of divine revelation [p. 123].

Relevant Research on Teaching Experience on Counselor Functioning

While there has been a paucity of research regarding the teaching experience prerequisite in school counselor preparation, some experimentation has been conducted on this issue. Given the constraints of state certification standards and the absence of unanimity among the profession's practitioners and trainers, however, this experimentation has been significantly limited in scope.

Lister and Northrup. Lister and Northrup (1970) reviewed the available research on the effects of teaching experience on school counselor functioning. Their findings are reported as hypotheses about the contributions of teaching experience to counselor effectiveness and presented under two major headings: interview behavior and guidance practice (p. 8).

In their examination of interview behavior, Lister and Northrup reviewed studies employing graduate students enrolled in counselor preparation programs (Campbell, 1962; Mazer, Severson, Axman & Ludington, 1965; Gazda, Clements, Duncan & Martin, 1967) and those involving practicing school counselors (Hopke, 1964) or individuals at the completion of their school counselor education programs (Campbell, 1962; Antenen & Lister, 1967). On the basis of these studies, Lister and Northrup make these generalizations regarding the relationship of teaching experience to counseling interview behavior:

> 1. When former teachers enter the counselor education experience, their characteristic mode of interacting during the counseling interview emphasizes the use of probing or diagnostic, interpretive, and evaluative responses with comparatively little emphasis upon responses that show the counselor's understanding of the student's perceptions and feelings. This response pattern appears, within the population of former teachers, to be related to counselor age rather than to the amount of experience as a teacher.
>
> 2. Experience as a counselor alone does not seem to alter the pattern of interview behavior noted. Former teachers who have been employed as counselors but who lack supervised experience in counseling exhibit an interview behavior pattern essentially like that of former teachers just entering a counselor education program.
>
> 3. Immediately upon completion of a supervised practicum in counseling, former teachers manifest a counseling interview behavior pattern distinctly different from that observed prior to the practicum. Post-practicum interview is characterized by a high emphasis on understanding responses and a comparatively low use of responses defined as interpretive, probing, evaluative or supportive. In addition, former teachers have been

shown to manifest, as a group, patterns of post-practicum interview behavior identical to that of non-teachers within the same counselor education program.

4. After completion of a counselor education program, including counseling practicum, former teachers appear to change in their interview behavior pattern in the direction of their pre-practicum style of interaction (particularly with respect to the use of probing responses), although this change appears to occur slowly, suggesting that the effects of the counselor education experience may be reflected in interview behavior for a period of several years [pp. 11-12].

The generalizations based on the above research studies have limitations; limitations which seem to apply to all of the research reported to date involving the teaching experience variable in school counselor certification. Of their investigation, Lister and Northrup (1970) cite the following limitations (which appear to be equally applicable to other research on this topic):

1. Where control groups were [are] employed, there is no evidence that teachers and non-teacher samples were equivalent on all dimensions, except for the variable of teaching experience. Until such studies are conducted, little can be concluded about the variations in counseling interview behavior that are a function of teaching experience.

2. Comparatively small samples were employed . . . with a consequently large sampling error possible.

3. The generalizations presented . . . come largely from cross-sectional data. Longitudinal studies are necessary to answer some of the questions about changes in counselor interview behavior across time.

4. The studies . . . involve students from several different counselor education programs, and the differences in program emphasis, selection criteria, and other variables peculiar to the institutions may have biased the data [p. 12].

Under their second major heading, guidance practice, Lister and Northrup examined two studies (Peterson and Brown, 1968 and Hopper, Brown and Pfister, 1970) involving counselors with and without teaching backgrounds. On the basis of these particular studies, Lister and Northrup hypothesize:

1. Beginning counselors who lack teaching experience feel less accepted by school administrators than their ex-teacher counterparts, although this feeling may be of short duration.

2. Whereas a prominent argument for teaching experience for counselors has emphasized the teaching background as a prerequisite for acceptance by teachers, counselors without a teaching background experience lower acceptance by school psychologists and social workers than by teachers.

3. Beginning counselors without teaching experience feel as competent as former teachers in their ability to counsel students, but less competent in counseling-related aspects of the guidance program.

4. The counselor without teaching experience and his principal agree to a significant extent regarding the counselor's acceptance in the school, his understanding of policies and procedures, and his ability to perform guidance activities.

5. Given actual in-school experience with counselors from a non-teaching background, many school principals would support the hiring of such a counselor by their own school boards [p. 14].

These hypotheses are limited in that the two studies reviewed report only the perceptions of the counselors and their principals (p. 14) and not on those of other publics of the counselor.

Lister. Lister (1969), in an earlier article, reviewed the current status of the teaching experience requirement for counselors, examined arguments opposing the requirement, reviewed research evidence on the effects of teaching experience on counselor performance, and offered proposals for the education and employment of school counselors without prior teaching experience. The generalizations which Lister draws from his review of the available research are based on several of the studies reported above by Lister and Northrup (1970) in addition to that conducted by Wittmer and Webster (1969). Lister's generalizations are essentially the same as those reached by Lister and Northrup (1970).

Grigsby. Grigsby (1970) used an experimental group of 144 secondary school student teachers enrolled at a state university and a control group of 77 non-student teachers at the same institution to study the effects of student teaching upon attitudinal characteristics considered basic for effective counselors. The study showed that prior to the student teaching experience, student teachers and other students do not differ in temperament and open-mindedness. Furthermore, student teachers who are open-minded also tend to be student centered. However, as shown by responses to personality tests, these qualities do not prove stable in the face of student teaching.

Boller. Boller (1970-71) reports a limited experiment by the State of Minnesota to prepare as school counselors persons without a teaching background. In 1969, four University of Minnesota graduates of liberal arts curricula were prepared as school counselors and certificated as same after the state's teaching experience requirements were waived (the special counselor preparation program was similar in many ways to the internship alternative presently provided in Wisconsin). These counselors, according to Boller, are reportedly "successful" in the schools in which they have been placed.

Kehas and Morse. Kehas and Morse (1970) conducted an open-ended interview of 12 school counselors in six Southern California school districts. Each counselor had taught at least six years and the average duration of teaching was 12 years. The counselors had been counseling less than two years and the interview focused on how they experienced the processes of role change from teacher to counselor. The intent was to determine whether prior teaching experience had been functional or dysfunctional to performance as a school counselor. Kehas and Morse found that (their findings were expressed as untested hypotheses):

> Having been a teacher was . . . dysfunctional to the extent that (a) it gave rise to ambivalence between the two roles, (b) demanded change in perspective toward the student, the school system, and the teachers, and (c) caused conflict by the necessity of changing the compliance system used with students.
>
> Having been a teacher was found to be functional to the counselor role in understanding and working with counselors and teachers on student-teacher problems.

> The dysfunctional aspects of having taught outweighed the functional aspects and inhibited positive identification with, as well as impeding adjustment to, the new role of counselor [p. 248].

Kehas and Morse (1971) continued their earlier study through a follow-up of the 12 teachers who had become school counselors. This later investigation deals with the intra-role conflicts and motivation for changing roles. Intra-role conflict is described as "when an individual 'perceives that others hold different expectations for him as the incumbent of a position. . .' [p. 201]."

Two hypotheses are offered by Kehas and Morse as a result of this study: "If having taught heightens the conflict in perceived incompatibility of role expectations, then teaching experience is dysfunctional to becoming a counselor [p. 203]." and "Teachers enter counseling primarily because they see it as a possible way of fulfilling an inner desire for personal growth toward what they perceive as their ideal role in education [p. 206]."

The counselors interviewed tended to note that many in the school system viewed them as administrators when they became teachers. This finding underscores firmly that teaching and administrating are the two primary roles in the schools. If you aren't one, then you must be the other. The challenge is to create a third viable role, a role not requiring teaching for an entry position (p. 207).

Kehas and Morse (1971) suggest that "long experience in teaching complicates assumption of the role of counselor [p. 206]." Based on their studies, Kehas and Morse conclude,

> Counselors apparently would function better in some regards with real and sustained experience in the classroom though it need be neither long enough nor involved enough for a prospective counselor to become emotionally embedded in and socialized to the cultural norms of teaching. Experience of this sort is best gained, perhaps, through an internship in schools. . . [p. 206].

Whetstone. Whetstone (1965) investigated the question of whether teachers and counselors have such similar personality structures that effective school counselors may be developed from a pool of interested teachers. The study was based on data obtained from a group of 25 counselors-in-training at the University of Alabama and 25 randomly selected Alabama teachers; all teachers having been designated by their principals as "superior" (p. 887).

Whetstone's conclusions were that counselors are (a) less conforming in their behavior than teachers; (b) less ego-defensive than teachers; (c) more benevolent than teachers; and (c) focus on sources of frustration more often than teachers (p. 889).

In Conclusion

The requirement that school counselors must first be "successful" classroom teachers is still very much a reality in most states of the nation. While the counseling profession as a whole seems to have moved toward not requiring teaching experience, state certification requirements have moved toward reducing but not eliminating this requirement. Further, many of the practitioners in the field continue to support the teaching experience requirement. As Wittmer and Lister (1973) state,

> Among the foremost reasons for this requirement seem to be the beliefs that (a) the effective counselor must understand the total school operation, an understanding best obtained through firsthand classroom experience; (b) teaching is a desirable proving ground which serves to screen out those who should not aspire to work as counselors; (c) teaching and counseling are in fact such inseparable aspects of the educational process that they cannot proceed independently; and (d) counselors who have first proven themselves as teachers are more readily accepted by other members of the school staff [p. 85].

The emphasis by those who maintain that teaching experience is necessary for aspiring school counselors has been that the counselor is an educator—an extension of the classroom teacher—and that there are certain desirable experiences and knowledge about the teaching/learning process essential to counseling which one gains *only* through preparation and experience as a teacher. No attempt seems to have been made through research to isolate the desired outcomes of teacher preparation and experience "essential" to success as a school counselor (Whetstone, 1965, made an initial thrust in this area.). If these variables do exist, perhaps such research would permit the development of a scale or other measurement to determine the extent to which aspiring counselors demonstrate suitable knowledge of these matters. The question of teaching experience for school counselors would then become moot.

As stated here, many of the arguments put forth in support of teaching experience for counselors are based principally upon emotion. Pierson (1954), in an allegory about Aesop and the school counselor, addresses one of the most pervading emotional positions in these comments,

> Counselors create problems for themselves, become ineffective with students, and often appear absurd when they attempt to behave like psychiatric social workers, clinical psychologists and psychiatrists [p. 326].

> Counselors are most effective when they think of themselves as experienced teachers, with special training in counseling . . .whose job is to help [others] . . .to carry on the process of educating the student [p. 329].

The *fear* seems to be that opening the school counseling ranks to non-teachers would produce a wave of clinically oriented individuals becoming school counselors

resulting in a heavy concentration on therapeutic activities in the guidance services field.

As noted earlier, Johnson (V.B., 1962), a former state supervisor of guidance services, addresses another of the principal emotional arguments frequently cited by those in favor of maintaining the teaching prerequisite for school counselors. He states,

> No teaching requirement means that educators may have a tough time evaluating persons who want to come into guidance. We don't want to be an 'Elephant's Burying Ground' for those who have been unable to make a success of other vocational endeavors [This is a gross assumption—that non-education majors seeking counseling positions would probably be failures in their previously chosen endeavors.]. Recommendations from business men may be fairly meaningless, since they may not know what kinds of qualities are necessary for successfully relating to children [p. 33].

But, the need for teaching experience for counselors in order to better identify with teachers may be overrated. Cohen (1961) states, ". . .cannot the implication that teaching experience alone enables a counselor to retain identification with teachers, even though his role has changed, be questioned [p. 70]?" The findings of Kehas and Morse (1970, 1971) seem to add support to this issue. Kehas and Morse (1971) found that the teacher experienced counselor is a product of the educational system to which he returns after his training program with some additional facts, techniques, and interactional experiences. He continues to identify with the teaching staff while neither teachers nor students see him this way; he is responded to as an adjunct of the administration and nothing in his preparation has helped him to cope with this ambiguity.

This question, then, does not seem to have been raised either for research or as a supposition:

> "If teacher experienced counselors are supposed to be better able to relate to teachers than are non-teaching experienced school counselors, why is it that teachers becoming counselors are more likely to be perceived by teachers as administrators (e.g., see Kehas & Morse, 1971) and thus less able to relate as peers because of misperceived line and staff relationships?"

Most advocates of eliminating the teaching experience requirement for counselors readily acknowledge that counselors need to be aware and understanding of the daily problems of teachers; that they need to understand the workings of the school community; that they need to work with teachers, administrators and others in and out of school including, of course, parents; and, to meet the needs of pupils. What is being questioned, however, is whether "X" number of years of unsupervised teaching gives any evidence that an individual is competent in all of the above areas.

Other questions raised by this review. This examination of the issues surrounding the teaching experience requirement for school counselors leads to other impressions regarding the matter. These include:

1. No one seems to have examined school counselors in non-public elementary and secondary school settings to determine (a) how qualified they are and (b) the extent of their prior teaching experience. If the response to the latter reveals a sizeable population of non-teaching experienced school counselors who otherwise meet state certification standards (as one measurement of "qualified"), this group might offer a promising population on which to examine the basic teaching vs. no teaching experience issue in counselor preparation.

2. Few writers have dealt with the roles of the state education agency (SEA) and the federal education agency (the U.S. Office of Education) in this issue. Some individuals have paid a cursory, passing acknowledgement to the influence of these agencies in maintaining teaching experience as a prerequisite to counselor certification. Yet, as Hoyt (1963) notes, SEAs must agree to provide certification to non-teaching experienced counselors (p. 129) before such individuals may expect to gain employment in the public schools. Experimentation in the preparation of non-teaching experienced counselors cannot meaningfully proceed without sanction of the SEAs and permissive language in the regulations of federal support programs for counseling and guidance services.

3. Most of the arguments surrounding the teaching experience issue in counselor preparation, at least through the 1960's seem to have been aimed at the secondary school level. Little has been written regarding the pros and cons of prior teaching experience for counselors at the elementary school levels. There is an increasing body of knowledge concerning the need for differential preparation programs for elementary school counselors. It is interesting to speculate as to whether prior teaching experience may indeed prove to be necessary for elementary school counselors and not for those working at the other grade levels.

4. The teaching experience issue does not seem to have involved cultural, social or ethnic arguments. No one, for example, has speculated that teaching experience might be detrimental to understanding the guidance and counseling needs of blacks— women—Chicanos, etc. However, responding to client needs in the cultural, social or ethnic milieu may require a more aggressive counselor personality and at least a few writers (Hobbs, 1958; Kinsey, 1971; Stubbins, 1970; and Warnath, 1973) have discussed this and its relationship to teaching experienced school counselors.

In this latter vein, Hobbs (1958) states,

> We should attempt to attract to the field of counseling bright young people from a variety of backgrounds. Our least promising candidate for training might be a person who has dutifully plodded through undergraduate majors in psychology and education. Our more promising candidates might be people who have a broad education with a limited amount of psychology and education. And our most exciting candidates might be people whose non-conforming tendencies, particularly in the realm of ideas, have gotten them into trouble elsewhere [p. 601].

Stubbins contends that counselors are not adequately prepared for coping with nor do they understand the influence that institutional procedures and values have on their work with counselees. He feels that the politics of counseling is an important dimension of counseling practice that begs for illumination. He states,

> If the counselor entered the field through an earlier career as a teacher, he is not likely to risk taking the view that the school is one cause of the student's problem. He might have tenure and be high on the salary schedule, and since he views himself essentially as an educator, he will hardly feel comfortable in a non-school setting. The politics of counseling would be a more appealing venture to the younger, professionally trained school counselor who is not so well anchored that he cannot take risks, and who would regard as an important challenge of counseling the task of engaging the institution in self-examination.

> Furthermore, we might anticipate a breed of counselor who is sufficiently committed to continuing his struggle in the larger community should he lose his position in the school [p. 614].

Warnath (1973) also believes that the teaching experience requirement for school counselors perpetuates the employment of individuals as school counselors whose primary identification remains with the institution and not with the individual. The counselor returns, after his training program, to the school perceiving himself as a member of the instructional staff (see also Kehas & Morse, 1970; 1971) and not as a member of a new professional group.

This examination of the issues surrounding the teaching experience requisite for school counselors reveals the matter to be a complex network of suppositions based more upon tradition than upon empirical research. Further, the limited data which have recently become available in support of eliminating teaching experience for counselors has not yet had an impact on counselor certification standards. The thinking of most practitioners in the profession still appears to be that expressed by Arbuckle (1967b):

> The majority of the counselors in schools today . . . were teachers before they were counselors. . . . because of this common background, it is easier for us to take for granted the concept that one should be a teacher before he can function effectively as a school counselor [p. 133].

Odell (1973), however, summarizes the situation most adequately in his observation on the future of counseling in the schools:

> . . . counselor training must become more interdisciplinary in its curriculum content and in concern for what it is that counselors are supposed to do for the people they serve. It is less important that counselors be trained in schools of education than it is that they be trained in the related fields of psychology, sociology, anthropology, human growth and development, family life education, economics, and manpower. It is less important that counselors have teaching experience as a pre-requisite to certification than it is that they have a variety of work and educational experiences, including practicum training, that equip them to cope with the wide range and variety of problems faced by their clients and their clients' families, fellow workers, and friends [p. 144].

Chapter II

Results in Wisconsin

Introduction

In the preceding chapter we have presented an extensive review of the arguments regarding the teaching experience requirement for school counselor certification. In the last few years the teacher surplus and anticipated counselor surplus have served to reduce the agitation for providing alternative routes to becoming a school counselor. The counseling profession may be going the way of many other professions by relying on tradition rather than empirical evidence for deciding how to best select and prepare counselors.

We believe the data presented in this chapter represent the first large scale attempt to evaluate whether a non-teacher can be an effective school counselor. We have tried throughout the monograph to present the issues and now the data in an unbiased manner. After reading the first chapter the reader is aware of the questions and the issues so you are prepared to draw your own conclusions from the data which follow.

Comparing Counselors With and Without Teaching Experience

How do the backgrounds and first year on-the-job effectiveness of counselors with and without teaching experience compare? The most pertinent findings from the comparisons of 88 intern counselors (IC's) with no teaching experience and 255 counselors with teaching experience (TC's) show:

1. Significantly more male ICs (59.1%) than female ICs (40.9%) have completed the program. It was anticipated by some that few males would participate in this alternate route to counselor certification due to the financial sacrifices which might be required in a two-year program of study.
2. The average age of the TCs (30.0) is significantly higher than that of the ICs (25.6) at the time of initiating school counselor preparation. Yet, the mean age of the ICs appears to be higher than many have speculated for non-teaching experienced persons beginning counselor education study.
3. Most of the female ICs, however, seem to enter the internship directly from

their undergraduate programs or with less than a year or two of work experience beyond completion of their baccalaureate degrees.

4. The undergraduate majors of the ICs tend to cluster in the humanities field—psychology, sociology, philosophy, etc. On the other hand, the undergraduate majors of the TCs are scattered broadly across many fields within education. Only the field of elementary education (19.6%) shows any appreciable concentration.

5. No significant difference exists between the undergraduate grade point averages (GPAs) earned by the ICs and TCs.

6. The graduate GPA of the ICs (3.8) is statistically significantly higher than that earned by the TCs (3.7). However, no meaningful basis exists upon which to draw conclusions regarding this difference. The lack of teaching experience, however, obviously does not handicap individuals in the satisfactory completion of school counselor preparation programs.

7. Significantly more ICs earn a practicum grade in the "A" range than do TCs. Also, male ICs do significantly better in practicum than their male TC counterparts.

8. A significant difference exists between the percentages of ICs (71.6%) and TCs (38.8%) who are presently employed as school counselors. It appears that an individual who completes the internship program is more likely to become a practicing school counselor than is his or her teaching experienced colleague upon completion of the school counselor preparation program.

Two survey instruments—the "Survey of Intern Counselors" (Appendix A) and the "Survey of Selected Factors of the Wisconsin Internship in School Counseling Program (Undergraduate GPA and Placement)" (Appendix B)—were used to collect the reported data.

Tables 1 and 2 provide present background data regarding participation in the internship alternative by individuals and schools. As show in Table 1, 115 individuals completed the internship in school counseling during the first five years of the program. Of these, 56 (48.7%) were male and 59 (51.3%) were female. Two universities, UW, Madison and UW, Oshkosh, account for 86 (74.8%) of the participants. During this period of time, only two individuals who began the internship phase of their preparation for counselor certification failed to complete the program; each terminating after one full semester. One individual began studies toward a Ph.D. in the field, a goal he had previously established. Another chose to remain as a counselor in a project in which he was working with Spanish-speaking migrants.

TABLE 1

TOTAL INTERNSHIPS, BY INSTITUTION, COMPLETED DURING THE PERIOD 1968-69 THROUGH 1972-73

Institution	Intern Counselors Male #	Male %	Female #	Female %	Totals #	Totals %
UW, Madison	12	20.3	38	67.9	50	43.5
UW, Milwaukee	7	11.9	5	8.9	12	10.4
UW, Oshkosh	28	47.5	8	14.3	36	31.3
UW, Platteville	4	6.8	1	1.8	5	4.4
UW-Stout (Menomonie)	8	13.6	4	7.1	12	10.4
Totals	59	100.1	56	100.0	115	100.0

TABLE 2

SCHOOL DISTRICTS EMPLOYING INTERN COUNSELORS AND BUILDINGS SERVED FROM 1968-69 THROUGH 1972-73

Location	School Districts	Types of School Buildings Served by Interns Elementary	Middle	High	Totals
Wisconsin Public	62	40	30	41	111
Wisconsin CESA	1	1	0	0	1
Wisconsin Non-Public	5	0	0	5	5
Out-of-State	4	0	2	3	5
Totals	72	41	32	49	122

12)—served by these internships. As shown, the interns have been employed in 62 (14%) of the 444 Wisconsin public school districts in the state, one of 19 CESAs (Cooperative Educational Services Agencies), five (6.3%) of the 80 non-public Wisconsin high schools and four out-of-state school districts. A total of 122 separate elementary and secondary school buildings have provided locations for the internship experiences.

Several school districts have employed two or more intern counselors during the period of their internship. Frequently, the internship has served as a vehicle to increase the counseling and guidance staff in the local school district. What usually happens is that a district will provide an internship for an individual, hire that person at the completion of the internship and create another internship at a subsequent point in time. This approach has been especially common in terms of expanding the guidance services staff to serve pupils in the middle and elementary schools where the district had not previously employed school counselors. The reason only one internship has been completed through a CESA placement reflects the problem these agencies have in meeting the supervisory requirements of the internship alternative.

Percentage of male and female ICs and TCs. In Table 3, the percentages of male, female and total ICs and TCs are reported. To make the appropriate comparisons, the reported percentages were tested for significance of differences using the Differences Between Uncorrelated Proportions Test (Guilford, 1965, pp. 185-187). A Z equal to at least 1.968 was needed for a .05 level of significance. The findings are discussed below.

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MALE AND FEMALE ICs and TCs

	ICs		TCs	
	#	%	#	%
Male	52	59.1	163	63.9
Female	36	40.9	92	36.1
Totals	88	100.0	255	100.0

Of the 115 persons completing the internship phase leading to counselor certification in the state, 27 (23.5%) were eligible for teacher certification in the

state; several having had some teaching experience but less than two years. These individuals were excluded from this study leaving 88 (76.5%) who qualified as ICs in terms of having no previous teaching experience and not being eligible to teach.

1. The observed percentages difference between male ICs and TCs is not significant ($\bar{Z}$= .8077).
2. The observed percentages difference between female ICs and TCs is not significant ($\bar{Z}$= .8077).
3. The observed percentages diffference between male and female ICs is significant ($\bar{Z}$= 2.41).
4. The observed percentages difference between male and female TCs is significant ($\bar{Z}$= 6.28).

However, any interpretation will have to be tempered regarding the percentages of participating male ICs *and* TCs. Specifically, the large number of male ICs includes 11 (12.5% of the 88 ICs) males who received substantial assistance under an Education Professions Development Act grant through the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh (UW-O) while completing their first year's on-campus experiences during 1970-71 and 1971-72. The University of Wisconsin, Madison (UW-MSN) on the other hand, which has produced over one-third of the ICs with no appreciable grants to attract students, has had 10 males and 22 females complete the internship. It should be noted, however, that if the 11 UW-O male ICs are excluded from Table 3, the males completing the alternative during 1968-69 through 1972-73 still outnumber the females.

The data reported in Table 3 are also intended to provide insight regarding the number of TCs entering the school counseling field via parallel preparation programs at the five state universities conducting the internship program. In actuality, the 255 TCs reported are a sample as opposed to total population. Only two institutions were able to indentify all TCs. These schools prepared 127 (77.9%) of the male TCs, 48 (52.2%) of the female TCs and 175 (68.6%) of the total population of TCs. Two of the universities experienced great difficulty in identifying TCs who had been in their counselor education programs. One important factor seemed to be the lack of an adequate records system prior to 1972. Also, one institution limits its counselor education enrollment annually and requires a year of residency at the master's degree level. Thus the number of TCs reported by this university accounts for only 17 (6.7%) of the TCs population in this study.

Average age at initiation of graduate studies. In Table 4, the average ages of ICs and TCs at the initiation of their counselor education studies are presented. The data are shown in a frequency distribution with mean ages also reported.

The data in Table 4 are presented to allow for an examination of the supposition

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION AND MEAN AGES OF ICs AND TCs AT INITIATION OF COUNSELOR EDUCATION STUDIES

Ages	ICs						TCs					
	Male		Female		Totals		Male		Female		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
21-25	32	61.5	29	80.6	61	69.3	47	28.8	41	44.6	88	34.5
26-30	12	23.1	1	2.8	13	14.8	57	35.0	17	18.5	74	29.0
31-35	3	5.8	3	8.3	6	6.8	26	16.0	10	10.9	36	14.1
36-40	1	1.9	1	2.8	2	2.3	21	12.9	8	8.7	29	11.4
41-45	2	3.9	2	5.6	4	4.5	5	3.1	11	12.0	16	6.3
Over 46							7	4.3	5	5.4	12	4.7
Unknown	2	3.8			2	2.3						
Totals	52	100.0	36	100.1	88	100.0	163	100.1	92	100.1	255	100.0
Mean Ages	25.6		25.4		25.6		30.0		30.0		30.0	

of some (Hutson, 1963, 1964; Miller, 1962; Peters & Van Atta, 1961; Swan, 1965) that school counselors without teaching experience will, as a group, be younger and, therefore, less mature and "stable" professionally than TCs.

The significance of the difference between the mean ages of the ICs (25.6) and TCs (30.0) was tested using Fisher's t-Test for Differences Between Uncorrelated Means (Guilford, 1965, pp. 183-185). A t score of 5.0145 was obtained indicating that a significant difference does exist between these mean ages. This difference is significant beyond the .05 level (339 df, t = 1.968).

While the ICs are significantly younger than the TCs, the mean age of the ICs is higher as a group than most of the above writers infer non-teaching experienced counselors would be. After completing the two years of study required in the internship alternative ICs' mean age at program completion would be 27.6.

A within-group examination of the ages of the ICs merits attention. Most of the female ICs (80.6%) are in the age range 21-25. This suggests that most of the females enter directly from their undergraduate programs or with less than two years of work experience beyond completion of their baccalaureate degree. Of the male ICs, 61.5% are in the same age bracket and 23.1% fall in the next higher age range, 26-30.

The undergraduate majors of ICs and TCs. The undergraduate majors of ICs and the TCs are presented in Table 5. Several of the majors have been grouped under a common heading (e.g., Biology, Chemistry, General Science, etc., under the heading, "Science").

In Table 6, the undergraduate majors of the ICs and the TCs are shown in a rank

TABLE 5

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS OF THE ICs AND TCs BY NUMBER, PERCENTAGE AND FIELD

Major	ICs						TCs					
	Male		Female		Totals		Male		Female		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Elementary Education							24	14.7	26	28.3	50	19.6
Agriculture	1	1.9			1	1.1	4	2.4			4	1.6
Home Economics			2	5.6	2	2.3			11	12.0	11	4.3
Physical Education							12	7.4	8	8.7	20	7.8
Industrial Arts							29	17.8			29	11.4
Safety Education							1	.6			1	.4
Business Education							5	3.1	2	2.2	7	2.7
Business Administration	3	5.8			3	3.4	1	.6			1	.4
English	1	1.9	5	13.9	6	6.8	10	6.1	14	15.2	24	9.4
Foreign Language							1	.6	2	2.2	3	1.2
Mathematics	1	1.9			1	1.1	8	4.9	2	2.2	10	3.9
Music							1	.6	5	5.4	6	2.4
Art							1	.6	3	3.3	4	1.6
Liberal Arts							1	.6			1	.4
Science	2	3.9			2	2.3	13	8.0	1	1.1	14	5.5
Social Studies	4	7.7	4	11.1	8	9.1	35	21.9	9	9.8	44	17.3
Military Science	1	1.9			1	1.1						
Philosophy	4	7.7			4	4.6	5	3.1			5	2.0
Psychology	25	48.1	14	38.9	39	44.3	3	1.8	3	3.3	6	2.4
Sociology	7	13.5	7	19.4	14	15.9	6	3.7	2	2.2	8	3.1
Social Welfare	3	5.8	3	8.3	6	6.8						
Special Education							1	.6	3	3.3	4	1.6
Orthopedic			1	2.8	1	1.1						
Unknown							2	1.2	1	1.1	3	1.2
Totals	52	100.1	36	100.0	88	99.9	163	99.9	92	100.3	255	100.2

order for each group based on number and percentage. It should be noted that all majors reported for the ICs are non-education majors. In Table 5, for example, one male IC reported having an undergraduate major in Agriculture while four male TCs have the same major. The TCs are all qualified to teach agriculture at the elementary or secondary school level while the IC is not.

The rank ordering of undergraduate majors presented in Table 6 is the most meaningful for the purposes of this study. Several (psychology, 44.3%; sociology, 15.9%; social studies, 9.1%; social welfare, 6.8%; and philosophy, 4.6%) of the undergraduate majors selected by the ICs can be said to represent the most desirable prerequisites to school counselor education (Dugan, 1960; Brown & Peterson, 1968; Havens, 1972; Norris, 1960; Swann, 1963; and Winkler, 1966). These areas comprise 80.7% (71 of 88) of the ICs' undergraduate majors. It is also worthy to note that none of the ICs were reported as "liberal arts" majors. This, again, has been a hypothesis of some critics of the internship alternative—that the program would provide an "easy" route to counselor certification in the state for a large number of liberal arts graduates who would otherwise find it difficult to obtain gainful employment. In a time of high teacher unemployment, the emotional basis of such a charge is easily understood.

TABLE 6

RANK ORDER OF UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS OF ICs AND TCs BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE

Rank	ICs Major	#	%	Rank	TCs Major	#	%
1	Psychology	39	44.3	1	Elementary Education	50	19.6
2	Sociology	14	15.9	2	Social Studies	44	17.3
3	Social Studies	8	9.1	3	Industrial Arts	29	11.4
4.5	English	6	6.8	4	English	24	9.4
4.5	Social Welfare	6	6.8	5	Physical Education	20	7.8
6	Philosophy	4	4.6	6	Science	14	5.5
7	Business Administration	3	3.4	7	Home Economics	11	4.3
8.5	Science	2	2.3	8	Mathematics	10	3.9
8.5	Home Economics	2	2.3	9	Sociology	8	3.1
12.5	Orthopedic	1	1.1	10	Business Education	7	2.7
12.5	Agriculture	1	1.1	11.5	Psychology	6	2.4
12.5	Mathematics	1	1.1	11.5	Music	6	2.4
12.5	Military Science	1	1.1	13	Philosophy	5	2.0
				15	Agriculture	4	1.6
				15	Art	4	1.6
				15	Special Education	4	1.6
				17.5	Foreign Language	3	1.2
				17.5	Unknown	3	1.2
				20	Business Administration	1	.4
				20	Liberal Arts	1	.4
				20	Safety Education	1	.4
	Totals	88	99.9		Totals	255	100.2

The undergraduate majors of the TCs are scattered widely across a spectrum of career fields. While three fields—elementary education (19.6%), social studies (17.3%), and industrial arts (11.4%)—stand out, only the first and third of these seem to merit some further attention. In the latter instance, any interpretation must take into account that 24 of the 29 TC industrial arts majors were in the University of Wisconsin-Stout (UW-Stout) program whose male TCs population represents 56.4% (92 of 163) of the total male TCs population. Further, this major represents one of very limited areas of concentration for males at UW-Stout and many of the institution's undergraduates subsequently enroll in the counselor education program.

The high percentage of undergraduate elementary education majors represented in the TCs population is rather surprising. This phenomenon has not been measured in any known studies of the state's available pool of school counselors. Presently, there are relatively few elementary school counseling positions in the public schools of the state. It is expected because of new state legislation, S.121.02(2)(g), that the demand for school counselors at this level will increase sharply. In light of the data presented in Table 10 concerning the percentages of TCs who actually take school counseling positions after completing their counselor education programs, it becomes interesting to speculate whether or not the state will be faced with as severe a shortage of elementary school counselors as predicted. Perhaps, many prepared counselors are available and working as classroom teachers while awaiting elementary school counselor employment opportunities within their school districts.

Undergraduate GPAs of ICs and TCs. In Table 7, the mean undergraduate GPAs achieved by the male and female ICs and TCs as well as for the totals of each group are presented. Fisher's t-Test for Differences Between Uncorrelated Means (Guilford, 1965, pp. 183-185) was used to test the possibility of a significant

TABLE 7

UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPAs) OF THE ICs AND TCs

	ICs		TCs	
	#	GPA	#	GPA
Male	52	2.66	160	2.68
Female	36	3.00	91	2.95
Totals	88	2.80	251	2.78
Unknown			4	

difference existing between the mean GPAs of the ICs and TCs (337 df, t = 1.968 significant beyond the .05 level).

It was determined that no significant difference exists between the GPAs of the ICs and TCs (t = .4502 with standard deviations of .4387 for the ICs and .3810 for the TCs). The range of undergraduate GPAs for the 88 ICs is 1.95 to 3.87 and 2.08 to 3.82 for the 251 TCs on a four point scale (A=4.00; B=3.00; etc.).

Graduate GPAs of ICs and TCs. The mean graduate GPAs of the ICs and TCs are reported in Table 8. Again, Fisher's t-Test was used to test for the possibility of a significant difference existing between the means (307 df, t = 1.968 significant at .05 level).

TABLE 8

GRADUATE GRADE POINT AVERAGES (GPAs) OF THE ICs AND TCs

	ICs		TCs	
	#	GPA	#	GPA
Male	52	3.77	141	3.71
Female	33	3.81	83	3.73
Totals	85	3.78	224	3.72
Unknown	3		31	

In measuring the variability, it was found that a significant difference does exist between the mean graduate GPAs of the ICs and TCs (307 df, t = 2.414 with standard deviations of .1810 for the ICs and .2096 for the TCs). The range of graduate GPAs for the 85 ICs is 3.25 to 4.00 and 3.00 to 4.00 for the 224 TCs. It should be noted that while a statistically significant difference does exist between these means, it holds no practical meaning. The actual difference of .06 in the mean GPAs provides no appreciable basis upon which to draw conclusions. On the other hand, the fact that the mean graduate GPA of the ICs and TCs are comparable suggests the lack of teaching experience and prior preparation as a classroom teacher does not handicap individuals in the satisfactory completion of a school counselor preparation program.

Average grade in practicum of ICs and TCs. In Table 9, the data comparing practicum grades are presented by the number and percentage of ICs and TCs receiving grades in three ranges (A+ to A-, etc.). Further analyses of these data have been made using the Differences Between Uncorrelated Proportions Test (Guilford, 1965, pp. 185-187) (Z = 1.968 significant at the .05 level).

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION AND PERCENTAGES OF GRADES RECEIVED IN PRACTICUM BY ICs AND TCs

Grade in Practicum	ICs						TCs					
	Male		Female		Totals		Male		Female		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
A- to A+	45	86.5	26	72.2	71	80.7	104	63.8	61	66.3	165	64.7
B- to B+	7	13.5	10	27.8	17	19.3	56	34.4	29	31.5	85	33.3
C- to C+							3	1.8	1	1.1	4	1.6
Not Given									1	1.1	1	.4
Totals	52	100.0	36	100.0	88	100.0	163	100.0	92	100.0	255	100.0

As shown in Table 9, 80.7% (71) of the ICs received a grade in the "A" range as compared to 64.7% (165) of the TCs. A significant difference exists between these percentages ($Z = 2.7882$). A closer examination of Table 9 shows that a higher percentage of male ICs (86.5%) earned a practicum grade in the "A" range than did male TCs (63.8%). This difference was also tested and found to be significant ($Z = 3.09$). The difference in the percentage of male ICs (86.5%) and female ICs (72.2%) receiving a practicum grade in the "A" range was also tested and found not to be significant ($Z = 1.62$).

These data can help in examining the argument of some (e.g., Cohen, 1961 and Noble, 1965) for eliminating the teaching experience requirement in school counselor certification in order to attract to the profession individuals less limited with regard to personality, intellect and training. While no significant difference was found to exist between the undergraduate GPAs earned by the ICs and TCs in this study, a significant difference was observed between the graduate GPAs earned by the two groups. This statistical difference, in fact, has no practical significance. The differences in grades received in practicum by ICs as compared to TCs does seem to merit attention. The ICs, and particularly the male ICs, did achieve significantly more "A" grades in this critical area of school counselor preparation. The importance of this finding is underscored by the fact that the practicum is the only course specifically required of all persons in the state's counselor certification standards. It is often used as a final screening device prerequisite to endorsement for certification.

Present employment status of ICs and TCs. In Table 10, data are presented pertaining to the employment status of the ICs and TCs. Selected portions of the data reported in Table 10 were identified for further analyses and testing using the Differences Between Uncorrelated Proportions Test (Guilford, 1965, pp. 185-187) ($Z = 1.968$ significant at the .05 level).

TABLE 10

PRESENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF
ICs AND TCs

Employment Status	ICs						TCs					
	Male		Female		Totals		Male		Female		Totals	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
School Counselor In Wisconsin	35	67.3	23	63.9	58	65.9	43	26.4	29	31.5	72	28.2
School Counselor Out-of-State	3	5.8	2	5.6	5	5.7	20	12.3	7	7.6	27	10.6
Classroom Teacher							34	20.9	17	18.5	51	20.0
Other Education	8	15.4	2	5.6	10	11.4	29	17.8	11	12.0	40	15.7
Out-of-Education	3	5.8			3	3.4	13	8.0	2	2.2	15	5.9
None	3	5.8	3	8.3	6	6.8	1	.6	11	12.0	12	4.7
Unknown			4	11.1	4	4.6	7	4.3	6	6.5	13	5.1
No Response			2	5.6	2	2.3	16	9.8	9	9.8	25	9.8
Totals	52	100.1	36	100.1	88	100.1	163	100.0	92	100.1	255	100.0

Employability of non-teaching experienced school counselors has been a long standing acceptable measure (Hoyt, 1962) regarding the inclusion of such individuals in the profession. Many critics of moves to eliminate teaching experience as a prerequisite to counselor certification have argued that few employment opportunities would actually be found in the schools for non-teaching experienced counselors. The findings reported in Table 10 seem to contradict this argument in that 65.9% (58) of the ICs are presently employed as school counselors in the state. Another 5.7% are working as counselors in other states. A total of 71.6% (63) of the ICs completing this alternate route to counselor certification are presently working in the field for which they have been prepared. The 11.4% (10) of the ICs presently employed in "Other Education" fields are working principally in student personnel work in higher education, a field closely allied to their graduate preparation. On the other hand, the 15.7% (40) of the TCs working in "Other Education" areas tend to be employed as school administrators and curriculum coordinators and a few are in student personnel work in higher education. The six (6.8%) unemployed ICs comprise a population interested in working as school counselors but unwilling to move from their home communities where no openings existed for school counselors.

The differences between the percentages of ICs and TCs presently employed as school counselors merits analysis. The following differences were tested for significance as described in the introduction to Table 10:

1. A significant difference was found to exist between the percentages of ICs (65.9%) and TCs (28.2%) employed as school counselors in the state ($Z = 6.28$).

2. A significant difference was found to exist between the percentages of ICs (71.6%) and TCs (38.8%) employed as school counselors regardless of location ($\chi^2 = 5.37$).

Obviously, a greater percentage of ICs than TCs are actually becoming school counselors. While the internship program has been acknowledged to be more costly to the participating institutions, this may actually turn out to be more reasonable in the long run than the continued preparation of large numbers of TCs many of whom evidently do not seek positions as nor become practicing school counselors. On the basis of employability alone, the internship does provide a viable alternate route to providing needed counselors in the state.

Findings of Three Institutional Evaluations of the Internship Program

As a condition of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction program approval of their internship program, each participating university is expected to periodically evaluate this alternate route to counselor certification in the state. To date, three institutions—the University of Wisconsin, Madison; the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh; and the University of Wisconsin-Stout (Menomonie)—have submitted evaluation studies to the WDPI. The findings of these studies are reported below.

University of Wisconsin-Stout. In this initial evaluation of the internship in school counseling program at UW-Stout, Grasmick (1973) conducted a case study of the five individuals completing the program during the period 1969-1972. Grasmick found that individuals who worked closely with the intern counselors, such as their local and university supervisors, were more optimistic and supportive toward the program than were school principals who had limited contact with the interns (pp.45-46). He states,

> It is viewed that those who invest their time and efforts into an innovation [such] as an internship program will be more likely to emphasize its merits and successes rather than its failures. There were reports from principals that the intern's effectiveness may have been improved through two years of teaching experience, but in no way was it suggested that the performance of the interns was anything short of meeting the expectations of the cooperating school and/or university supervisory personnel [p.46].

Grasmick (1973) concludes that the internship alternative as it exists does not have sufficient administrative support as an effective means for school counselor preparation (p.47). Yet, of the five interns in this study, four are presently working as full-time counselors—two in the same districts where their internships were

completed and two in districts which had not previously participated in the internship program. Of the two school districts not hiring the interns as full-time school counselors, both have subsequently taken additional intern counselors. The one intern counselor studied in this investigation who is not presently employed as a school counselor has joined her husband in a family sponsored business.

University of Wisconsin, Madison. Dilley, Foster and Bowers (1973) conducted a study in March 1971 of 11 employed counselors with teaching experience and 12 employed intern counselors each of whom had no prior experience as teachers. All counselors in the study had entered the university's two-year Master's program in September 1969. The study involved a comparison of the TC counselors with the IC counselors on the basis of ratings made by the local school counselor supervisors and associates (building principal, other pupil personnel services workers, teachers) in the school setting.

Raters were asked to compare the new counselor in question with other first year counselors they had known. The scale called for checking whether the new counselor was more effective, as effective, or less effective on each of five dimensions—implementing school guidance services, staff relationships, working without supervision, adjusting to school conditions, and overall performance. Responses were received on all 12 IC counselors and on 10 TC counselors from 22 school principals, 22 supervising school counselors, 15 pupil personnel services workers and 15 classroom teachers (p.27).

These findings as reported were:

> On the first three dimensions at least 50 percent of both T and I counselors were rated as being more effective. On dimension five (overall performance), perhaps the most important, 67 percent of the counselors in both groups were rated as more effective. Because of the certification requirements in Wisconsin, it can be assumed that the comparison group — other counselors the raters had known — were counselors with teaching experience. The I counselor rating data suggests counselors without teaching experience can perform as or more effectively than counselors with teaching experience. . . . [p. 27].
>
> The T counselors appear to have a slight edge where teaching experience presumably makes a difference—adjusting to school conditions, staff relationships, and implementing guidance services. However, in the key comparison — overall performance — as many I counselors as T counselors were perceived to be on the highest level of effectiveness. . . .
>
> The principals evaluated eight of the T counselors more effective, and two as effective, seven of the I counselors more effective, five as effective and none less effective. The supervisors evaluated eight of the T counselors more effective, and two as effective, and ten of the I counselors more effective, and two as effective and none less effective. The hypothesis that teaching experience is not necessary is supported, . . . [p. 28].

Dilley (1972c) also conducted a study on the employability of internship prepared school counselors who completed the UW, Madison program during the period 1969-70 through 1971-72. His study includes 21 ICs and nine individuals who were eligible to teach but who had taught (if at all) less than the two years necessary for counselor certification in the state. Dilley reports:

> After they had completed their internships, 28 of the 30 (90 percent) were offered employment as school counselors in school situations in which they were competing with counselors who had been teachers. This record, incidentally, was made at a time historically when jobs were not plentiful. . . .
>
> Of the 24 [schools which had employed intern counselors], 23 (96 percent) either retained their interns to fill counselor positions or requested that they be provided another intern the next year [p. 133].

University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh. The internship program at the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh (UW-O) was conducted under an Education Professions Development Act grant during the years 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73.

Havens, divided his study of UW-Oshkosh interns into three areas. These included (a) the employability of the intern school counselors, (b) the satisfaction of school administrators with the performance of the intern counselors, and (c) a comparative study of the perceived effectiveness of intern counselors and teaching experienced school counselors. The results are based on 24 intern counselors who completed their programs at UW-O during 1969-70 through 1971-72.

Regarding the first area (employability) of his study, Havens (1972) reports:

> . . . of the twenty-four interns who have completed the program to date, twelve or fifty percent were retained as school counselors in the school system where they completed their internship experiences. . .Nine or thirty-eight percent have obtained school counselor positions in schools other than those in which they completed their internship experiences. Two of the twenty-four are employed [one in a college counseling position and the other as an elementary school counselor in a children's psychiatric hospital program] outside of K-12, and one is unemployed. . . .
>
> Another way to look at the question of employability of school counselors and interns from this program is to consider the number of schools who continued with the internship program. From 1969-1972, nineteen school districts have been involved in the program. . . .Six of the nineteen schools (thirty-two percent) have continued with the internship program for at least a second year. . . .fourteen of the nineteen schools (seventy-four percent) either continued in the internship program, hired their interns as school counselors, or both [p. 34].

In the second area studied (satisfaction of school administrators), Havens surveyed school administrators who had hired intern school counselors *and* those who had hired as school counselors individuals who had gained certification via completion of the internship program. In the former instance, questionnaires were received from all 23 administrators who had interns from UW-O during 1970-71 and 1971-72. Havens (1972) found:

> Of the 1970-71 interns, six of eight or seventy-five percent were seen as effective while 14 of 15 of the present (1971-72) interns were rated effective or better. In total, seventeen of twenty-three would have been retained in permanent positions [p. 36].

Responses from eight of the nine school administrators employing students who had completed internships at UW-O indicated:

> . . . satisfaction with the performance of the school counselors who were certified through the internship program. It is of interest to note that seven of the eight will be rehired for 1972-73; one will not be rehired but only because the position is being cut for lack of federal funds, and this individual has successfully sought another position and will be a full-time counselor in Wisconsin for 1972-73 in a different school district [p. 38].

The third major dimension of Haven's (1972) study of individuals completing the internship program through UW-O provides a testing of 12 hypotheses comparing the perceived performances of four groups—(a) 15 intern counselors serving their internships during 1971-72 (present interns); (b) 22 teaching experienced school counselors (control counselors) employed in schools with the present interns; (c) seven former intern counselors who completed their programs during 1969-71 and were employed as school counselors during 1971-72 (past interns); and (d) 10 teaching experienced school counselors who completed their preparation through the UW-O counselor education program (UW-O control counselors). Havens (1972) summarizes the results and conclusions regarding this perceptual dimension as:

> There appears to be no differences in the effectiveness of the performance of persons trained throughout the internship program (without teaching experience) and those persons trained through regular counselor education programs (with teaching experience) as perceived by student clients, teachers, administrators, and other pupil personnel workers. Secondly, with the exception of the comparison of present interns and control counselors, there appears to be no differences in knowledge between those persons trained through regular counselor education programs (with teaching experience) as compared to those persons trained through the internship program [p. 63].

Regarding this second point, Havens (1972) also points out:

> Since the control counselors had a mean counseling experience of 5.8 years (interns .5 and UW-O control counselors 3 years) it may well be that the differences in perception of the knowledge of control counselors over present interns is due to years of counseling experience rather than whether or not they had teaching experience [p. 67].

The only appreciably negative finding in these three studies, as far as the viability of the internship alternative, was the lack of sufficient administrative support as reported by Grasmick (1973, p. 47). Yet, the findings of Dilley, Foster and Bowers (1973), Dilley (1972c), and Havens (1972) in this do not support Grasmick. In fact, these latter two studies seem to provide an adequate basis for rejecting Grasmick's conclusion, especially in light of the relatively small sample involved in his study.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is no evidence to show that having taught contributes to success as a school counselor. The irony of the matter is, however, that the burden of proof in the debate over the requirements seems to rest with those challenging the need for

teaching experience in that advocates of teaching experience do not seem to provide research to support their position.

As shown in this case study of Wisconsin's experiment with the teaching variables in school counselor preparation, a serious question has been raised regarding the teaching prerequisite to counselor certification. In order to further strengthen an internship model such as Wisconsin's, the following additional areas merit further examination:

1. School counselors (with prior teaching experience) who have been away from teaching five or more years should be studied in terms of their ability to relate to teachers, to demonstrate empathy for the classroom climate, to be perceived as a member of the teaching staff, etc. The argument that TCs better relate to teachers because they have been one appears to be a myth, especially the longer one is away from the classroom.

2. Few attempts seem to have been made through research to isolate the outcomes of teacher preparation and experience which are "essential" to success as a school counselor. If the teaching requirements are valuable to counselor functioning, it seems important to determine what aspects are most important. If these are valid, perhaps such research would permit the development of a scale or other measurement to determine the extent to which aspiring counselors can demonstrate acceptable proficiency as opposed to the chance factors involved in "X" years of classroom teaching.

3. An additional four areas are in need of further study; (a) counselors in non-public school settings, (b) the role of SEAs and the USOE in perpetuating teaching experience requirements, (c) the teaching experience variable in the preparation of elementary school counselors, and (d) teaching experience as contributing to or retarding counselor response to the cultural, social and ethnic milieu.

In Closing

The school counseling profession has reached the point at which the teaching requirements should be dropped from its certification requirements. While additional evidence may be necessary for some of the "diehards," the Wisconsin internship program has proven to be a viable alternative. Farwell (1961) puts the matter in good perspective in his statement:

> School administrators should demand professionally prepared counselors. They should not select chemistry teachers for counselors but chemistry teachers to instruct in chemistry. It has always been a wonderment why counselors aren't hired in terms of their knowledge about counseling and their commitment to counseling rather than those reasons which have persisted during the past decades. In 1961 [doubly so in 1976], antiquated notions

about the proficiency of personnel prepared as experts in instruction for implementing counseling procedures should be dissipated [pp. 40-41].

Chapter III

Implementation In Wisconsin—A Possible Model

In this chapter, procedures followed by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) in the implementation and development of the state's internship in school counseling program are described together with obstacles encountered and dealt with. Also presented is the historical background leading to the changes in Wisconsin's counselor certification standards which made possible the initiation of this alternative to teacher preparation and teaching experience as prerequisites in counselor certification.

Introduction

Proponents (American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1961; Boller, 1970-71; Farwell, 1962; Kehas & Morse, 1971; Noble, 1965; Nugent, 1966; O'Brien, Bailey & Fitzgerald, 1966; Peterson & Brown, 1968; and Trow, 1961) of eliminating teacher preparation and teaching experience as prerequisites in the state certification of school counselors readily acknowledge the desirability of prior school experiences and/or a demonstrated knowledge of schools as a social entity. What is argued is whether preparation as a classroom teacher and actual teaching experience is the only way of acquiring this competency. This position has been summarized in a paper describing counselor training standards prepared by the American Psychological Association (1962):

> The school counselor, like other qualified specialists in the school system, should have a thorough knowledge of schools and the educational setting; however, teaching experience is not the only way of acquiring this knowledge and hence is not a necessary prerequisite to becoming a counselor. The key factors are skill in relating to both children and adults, competence in working with them in an educational setting, and understanding of the objectives, methods, and mores of that setting [pp. 149-150].

As noted in Chapter I, a few states are beginning to change their school counselor certification requirements pertaining to the teaching experience requisite. Boller (1972) reports that the most prevalent alternative to teaching experience is the internship or in-school practicum experience; the internships ranging from no less than six weeks up to two years in duration (p. 389).

Boller also brings in the importance of working to change the certification standards of state education agencies if it is to be possible to recruit, prepare *and employ* as school counselors individuals who have their undergraduate preparation in fields outside of education. He states,

> Opposition to a change that would eliminate teaching background as a requirement is sometimes centered in certification sections of state departments of education. . . . as it stands this separate certification group must agree before any change can be made [p. 391].

Until 1968, eligibility for a teaching credential in the state and two years of successful teaching experience were required as part of the process to earn school counselor certification in Wisconsin. That year, Wisconsin became one of the first states in the nation to provide an alternative to teaching experience for school counselors when the following regulation was adopted effective September 1:

> The state superintendent may approve experimental programs based on completion of a master's degree in guidance and counseling and including completion of a full-time, one-year public [*] elementary or secondary school counseling internship. The state superintendent, at his/her discretion, may waive the teacher certification and two-year teaching experience requirements in the approval of such experimental programs [Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1972, p. 17].
>
> *Since 1970 internships in school counseling have also been approved in private elementary and secondary schools.

The Wisconsin plan was to provide a program making it possible to prepare and certify as practicing school counselors persons who not only lacked previous teaching experience but who were not even eligible for teacher certification. The program provided *in Wisconsin* the alternative of an approved one-year, full-time internship in school counseling under the supervision of a certificated local school counselor and faculty from the preparing university in lieu of the prerequisite of teacher preparation and two years of teaching experience. The internship was to follow the completion of a one-year, full-time, on-campus experience in which the academic requirements for a Master's degree in counseling and guidance services would be completed.

Historical Background

The school counselor internship alternative in Wisconsin grew out of the work of a committee on certification standards of the Wisconsin Personnel and Guidance Association (WPGA). This committee was appointed in 1963 to monitor the then newly established Wisconsin school counselor certification standards and to serve as a focal point for further strengthening of Wisconsin's school counselor certification

standards in the ensuing years. During 1965-66, the committee began to formulate rather significant proposals for changes in these certification standards.

Principal among these changes were proposals that the initial credential for school counselors be a non-renewable certificate and that a practicum in school counseling be required. This first change provided school counselor certification for those persons who had less than a Master's degree in counseling and guidance or its equivalent and/or no experience in the field. At this point in time during the committee's deliberations, a receptiveness developed to test the concept of the teaching experience requirement for school counselors.

In early 1967, the committee made its final recommendations to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for substantive change in the state's school counselor certification standards. These recommendations of the committee comprising at that time representatives of the WDPI, counselor education departments in the state, school counselors, classroom teachers, and school administrators proposed the internship in school counseling as an alternative to the teacher certification and teaching experience requirements for the preparation of school counselors in Wisconsin. The proposed changes were also presented to and endorsed by the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Committee of the Wisconsin Education Association.

As provided for in Wisconsin Statutes (Wis. Admin. Code section PI 1), it was necessary that the State Superintendent conduct a hearing on the proposed changes in the certification standards (the options available to the State Superintendent to accept, modify or reject the proposed changes have been described in Chapter I). It is interesting to note that during the hearing many counselor publics (i.e., PTA groups, the WPGA certification committee itself, the school boards association) supported the idea of an internship in lieu of teacher preparation and teaching experience but the only identifiable resistance to the initiation of the internship alternative came from a few school counselors themselves. The contention at this point on the part of these counselors was the time worn argument advanced in much of the profession's literature, "In order to successfully relate to classroom teachers, school counselors have to themselves have had teaching experience."

Internship Program Development

The implementation and maintenance of this alternative program in school counselor preparation has been dependent upon a cooperative relationship between three parties—the preparing institutions, the employing school districts and the WDPI. It has been the responsibility of the latter by nature of the state's certification process to coordinate the internship program in terms of policy development, operation and assessment. In this capacity, the department is responsible for (a) working with counselor education staffs at those universities

developing internships in school counseling; (b) reviewing university preparation programs which eventually lead to certification of counselors through this alternate program; and (c) coordinating the annual operation of the internship option.

Wisconsin grants certification on the basis of an applicant's having completed a program approved or approvable by the state education agency. At least once every four years, each of the state's teacher training institutions is visited by a team of evaluators. Every preparation program leading to certification is reviewed and assigned an approval status. In reviewing new and existing school counselor education programs in the state, the Department employs the standards of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision as well as its own standards. Applicants for counselor certification who have completed their counselor education program at an out-of-state institution (the teaching experience and licensure requirements *may not be waived under these circumstances*) must have graduated from a program which is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or which is otherwise recognized by that state's education agency.

To explain the internship in school counseling program, staff members of the WDPI conducted a conference for representatives of the seven school counselor preparation programs holding such program approval in 1968. Initially, the following responsibilities for developing internship proposals were discussed with counselor educators as the WDPI invited applications from universities wishing to offer this alternative in school counselor preparation:

1. Responsibilities of the cooperating university
   - 1.1 method of selecting candidates for internships
   - 1.2 limitation of the number of interns placed annually
   - 1.3 on-site supervision by university staff
   - 1.4 recommendation for certification procedures
   - 1.5 placement coordination with the WDPI (names, site, etc. in advance)
   - 1.6 evaluation of internship experiences and sites
2. Responsibilities of the cooperating schools
   - 2.1 on-site supervision
   - 2.2 facilities, materials, travel, etc.
   - 2.3 salary
   - 2.4 balanced on-the-job experiences
3. Responsibilities of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
   - 3.1 ascertain local school counselor-pupil ratios—maximum 1:400 (the intern could be included at .5 full-time equivalent [FTE])
   - 3.2 ascertain quality of local school counseling and guidance programs

3.3 certification
3.4 evaluation of the internship program
3.5 definition of a full-year internship

The WDPI did not anticipate that each state institution conducting a counselor education program would choose to initiate and offer the internship. Among other factors, the development of the internship would require additional staff and would increase field supervision costs. However, each institution was free to submit proposals for internships in school counseling for WDPI review.

As internship program applications were received from counselor education programs by the WDPI, members of the WDPI staff conducted visitations to the various counselor education campuses. These visits were concerned primarily with reviewing and discussing in further detail the respective roles of all parties to be involved in implementing proposed internships in school counseling.

Subsequently, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction approved the school counselor internship alternative in the counselor education programs of five universities in the state. These approved programs, each effective with the start of the 1968-69 school year include:

1. University of Wisconsin, Madison
2. University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
3. University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
4. University of Wisconsin, Platteville
5. University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie

Descriptions of each institution's programs for the preparation of school counselors through the internship alternative are included in the monograph edited by Erpenbach (1973), *Internships in School Counseling: A Wisconsin Alternative.* A review of these program descriptions will show that each institution's approach to the preparation of school counselors through the internship alternative is different. This is due primarily to the fact that the WDPI resisted any attempt to provide a stereotypic format to be followed at each campus in developing and conducting its internship program believing that more than one approach to this alternative could be equally viable.

To monitor the development of the internship program in school counseling, the WDPI also planned and carried out occasional conferences for the university coordinators of this alternative program and workshops for the intern counselors and their local and university supervisors. The agendum for the meetings with the university coordinators generally included the following objectives (from files of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction):

1. To review the status of the internship in school counseling program.

2. To consider procedural or other changes necessary to the program.
3. To review collected evaluative data.
4. To plan for the further development of the program.

Workshops for the intern counselors and their local and university supervisors included the following objectives (from the files of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction):

1. To gather evaluative data on the development and performance of intern counselors.
2. To provide feedback to the counselor education programs.
3. To consider modifications to the internship program.
4. To provide a training experience for local supervisors of intern counselors.
5. To discuss expectations for the internship experience with the interns and their local and university supervisors in order to realize a high degree of unanimity between the internships.
6. To strengthen the intern's school experience and contribution.

Implementation Obstacles

As noted earlier, this alternate school counselor preparation effort was conducted without specifically stated operational guidelines for the universities, local schools, and the WDPI during the first two years of the internship program in Wisconsin (1968-69 and 1969-70). This was intentional as all involved parties felt it better to have an initial period to try various approaches to implementing the internship experiences within the context of the perceived responsibilities. During the third year of the program (1970-71) the types of "problems" or "obstacles" encountered and dealt with were summarized and discussed by the WDPI staff and the coordinators of the five university internship programs. Policies were subsequently developed in response to these matters and are reported in the succeeding section on guidelines. The "hurdles" in implementing the internship alternative in Wisconsin included:

1. The internship idea needed to be "sold" to many local educational agencies. This obstacle was partially overcome by stressing the university and local

school supervisory commitments to the intern counselors, the "carry-over" contribution to be gained by the school's on-going guidance program, the opportunity to evaluate a potential employee for a one-year period and the opportunity to have action research conducted on the internship project. The university supervision often results in "free consulting" to the local schools and is seen by school administrators as a definite advantage.

2. The type, nature and degree of supervision to be provided the intern has been extensively discussed between the WDPI and the cooperating universities. Questions have included: "How often should on-site supervision be provided by the cooperating university?" "What is the nature of the WDPI's local school supervisory relationship?" "What is meant by the term 'supervision' in each of these cases?" "What is 'good' supervision?"

3. The levels of budgeted support for the interns have been a continuing concern. The questions have included: "Can an intern be reimbursed for his/her travel to required on-campus seminars?" "Should the local school assume any of the costs for university supervision?" "Could remuneration be made to the cooperating local supervisor?" "How should the intern's salary be determined?" A particular problem has been to distinguish for some school districts the differences between the intern counselors and teacher interns; thus, a rationale for higher salaries for intern counselors.

4. What type of contractual agreement should exist between the training institutions and the local schools hiring the intern? What are the intern's ethical and/or legal obligations in case of a teacher strike? (Since 1970-71, intern counselors have occasionally been involved in teacher strikes and local grievance processes.)

5. What university enrollment requirements should be made during the time of the internships? Should interns be enrolled full-time or less than full-time; if so, how much less in the graduate school sponsoring their internship?

6. What type of student is the internship intended for — non-teaching majors only? — teaching majors with less than two years teaching experience or no teaching experience only?

7. What about non-public school settings for intern placements? What about out-of-state placements?

8. The role and function of the intern—is he or she to be regarded as a full-fledged member of the hiring school staff and treated as one would treat any beginning staff member? Or, is he or she something less than that? How much of the working week should be spent in the internship vs. how much in any non-guidance duties expected by the school?

9. To what extent should there be comparability in the state of internship

experiences among the various specialties? Internships are also provided in such other disciplines as social work, school psychology, school administration and teaching. Could the WDPI provide the opportunity for the appropriate persons to come together to begin work toward a set of guidelines that could be used by all?

Development of Policies for Internships

In late 1970, the WDPI conducted a meeting for university coordinators of the internships in school counseling program. In this third year of the internship alternative, a first draft of proposed procedural policies was presented by the WDPI. The development of these procedural policies was based upon the experiences of the WDPI, universities and the local schools during the first two years of the internship effort. Subsequently, this draft was evaluated at conferences involving the intern counselors, their local and university supervisors and staff members of the WDPI as well as at meetings of the university coordinators of the internship program with the WDPI.

These policies governing the conduct of the internship in school counseling program in Wisconsin and now operational (subject to annual review and amendment) are:

1. Site Approval—The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction reserves the right to final site approval for internship placements. The issuance of an intern's certificate is normally considered evidence of WDPI site approval. Requests to the WDPI for site approval should not be made by the institution until it has determined that all site standards are satisfactorily met.

2. Site Standards—The following are recommended standards for all intern counselor site placements:

   2.1 Full-time local supervision should be provided by a certificated school counselor.
   2.2 The counselor-pupil ratio should not exceed 1:400. The intern may be included as .5 FTE (full-time equivalent) in determining this ratio.
   2.3 The intern should not normally be hired as a replacement for a certificated school counselor.
   2.4 A private office, suitably equipped, should be provided for the intern. This office will preferably be located in the school's guidance center.
   2.5 A heterogeneous assignment of pupils to the intern is preferred. This

pupil load should include representation from all grades served by the guidance staff in that building (e.g., grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 if so organized).

2.6 Placement in a single building unit within the school district (10, 11 and 12 if so organized) is preferred.

3. Eligibility for the Internship in School Counseling—This program is essentially for persons whose undergraduate degree is not in education. It is expected that internships will be approved for only those persons who meet this situation. Persons qualified to teach at the elementary or secondary school level who desire to become school counselors are expected, in addition to their graduate preparation for counseling and guidance work, to teach the required number of years as a part of gaining school counselor certification.

   Selection of intern candidates and admission to counselor education programs are the prerogatives of the institutions conducting such approved programs. However, it is expected that persons admitted to internship programs will usually have done their graduate preparation (didactic and experiential) in counseling and guidance at the institution with which they will complete the internship phase of their preparation.

   Internships should, as nearly as possible, always begin at the opening of the school year rather than at other points in the academic calendar.

4. Internship Application—A formal application for approval of the internship in school counseling shall be made *in advance* by the university to the WDPI for all persons desiring Wisconsin school counselor certification under the provisions of this program. This includes those whose internship placement will be out of the state. This application will normally be made in the semester preceding initiation of the internship. Interns may not initiate formal negotiations for placement in a local school district without written tentative site placement approval from the WDPI.

5. Salary—The negotiation for salary is between the intern counselor, the institution and the contracting school district. The minimum salary to be paid to an intern is expected to be not less than $5,200.00. Institutions are also encouraged to arrange for pay for local supervisors.

6. Supervision—The responsibility for supervising interns rests principally with the sponsoring university. This supervision should include:

   6.1 University—On-site visits each semester by the university supervisor.
   6.2 Local—On-site supervision by a certificated, full-time school counselor.
   6.3 State Education Agency—On-site visit each semester by a WDPI staff member.

7. University Enrollment—The intern will be enrolled as a graduate student

during the year of internship. It is recommended that this be a full-time enrollment. Also, on-campus seminars for the intern are encouraged to meet regularly at least the equivalent of one-half day weekly.

8. Elementary vs. Secondary School Settings—The site standards and expectations for the internship are identical regardless of grade level setting. That is, the requirements that are expected to apply in a senior high school of grades 10, 11 and 12 also apply to K-6, 6-8, 7-9 or other such grade combinations.

9. Federal Programs—The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction will not approve internship placements in programs or activities specifically funded through categorical Federal or state aid programs. These programs may require that funded professional personnel be fully certificated and that the person perform a delimited role and function or call for special training and experience. The internship is one part of the graduate training program leading to certification as a school counselor. Therefore, the intern would not ordinarily be qualified to serve as a counselor in, for example, an Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Title I, Vocational Education Act or other such project.

   Since 1975-76, the WDPI has approved a limited number of internships supported by Federal or State funding. The purpose of these approvals has been to test the appropriateness of such placement in order to obtain data upon which to re-examine this policy.

10. Credentialing—An intern's credential is required for all persons completing internships in school counseling in Wisconsin. Persons serving approved internships out of the state must hold any similar credentials so required by that state education agency. Application for the intern credential *must be submitted* to the office of internships at the intern's university *and forwarded* to the Bureau for Teacher Education and Certification, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 126 Langdon Street, Madison 53702 *before* starting the internship in school counseling.

11. Certification—Upon satisfactory completion of the internship, an intern becomes eligible for "school counselor—provisional level" certification from the State of Wisconsin. Interns may not be recommended for the "professional level" certification as they lack the required years of counseling experience.

Monitoring the Internship Program Through Workshops

To monitor the internship program, the WDPI sponsored workshops (as noted earlier) for the intern counselors and their local and university supervisors. Essentially, these were planned independently of each other with the immediate goal examining selected aspects of the internship alternative. The first three workshops were especially instrumental in the successful implementation of the alternative. The first addressed primarily the gathering of evaluative data on the preparation and performance of the intern counselor. The second was directed at an examination of the role of the local supervisor and strengthening the supervisory function. The third workshop was the only one primarily structured to evaluate the guidelines/policies which had evolved for the internships in school counseling. All three workshops did share the common objectives of (a) providing feedback to the five participating universities and the WDPI, (b) considering modifications which should be made in the internship program (serving also to monitor the progress of this alternate route to counselor certification in the state), and (c) providing a learning experience to broaden the skills of the intern counselors.

The outcomes of these workshops cannot be stated in quantifiable terms because they were not planned with this goal in mind. However, the proceedings and other pertinent matters (i.e., issues discussed, recommendations) are available in the form of anecdotal records which are useful in a reporting on the findings of this alternative preparation program.

The first workshop. The participants in this workshop included approximately 25 intern counselors, seven counselor educators, three WDPI staff members and seven other local school personnel. The major objective was to gather initial evaluative data on the development and performance of the intern counselor. The format utilized an invited out-of-state expert in the field of school counseling and guidance services to observe and share impressions, small group discussions, reactions to the program by a panel of principals and local school district supervisors (cooperating school counselors) and large group reaction sessions. A workshop summary was provided by the invited expert who presented his impressions of the status of the internship alternative. The opinions expressed were based on two days of observation at the workshop and interaction with workshop participants.

In this workshop the principal opportunities for participant responses to areas of concern regarding the internship program occurred during small and large group discussion periods. Initially, all participants were divided into four heterogeneous groups each under the leadership of a university supervisor. These groups comprised interns from each of the three participating universities (two of the institutions did not have interns present or were not able to place interns during 1970-71) and a few other school personnel—i.e., building principals, other administrative staff and WDPI personnel. The discussions at the meetings of these groups were centered on reviewing various aspects of the orientation to the internship and assessment of the

intern's on-the-job experiences and performances. The topics to be discussed in group meetings were not prescribed in any manner. Each group leader was instructed only to guide the discussion in terms of the major objective of the workshop (to gather evaluative data on the development and performance of the intern counselor). Following each small group meeting period, a large group session involving all workshop participants was scheduled to provide feedback and attempt to achieve consensus on issues and concerns brought forth concerning the internship program.

As stated, the major objective of this first workshop was to gather evaluative data concerning the development and performance of the intern school counselors. While the workshop had been carefully planned and key personnel such as discussion leaders had been prepared to work toward this achievement, the actual outcomes of the workshop related only indirectly to this desired end. Instead, the workshop served essentially as a forum in which to set forth areas of concern regarding supporting and enhancing experiences for the intern both in terms of pre-service and in-service. The implication seemed to be that if the stated areas of concern could be satisfactorily mitigated, then the intern counselor was more likely to develop professionally and be more effective on the job.

The issues concerning the satisfactory implementation of the internship in school counseling alternative as raised at this workshop parallel closely the "hurdles" described earlier thus serving to lend validity to these variables in the program. Additionally, these issues or concerns were raised for the first time:

1. The descriptive term, "intern," is seen as a poor label suggesting to others that the individual so designated does not possess adequate skills to carry out a professional assignment in the schools. Some intern counselors have experienced problems in interpersonal relationships with teachers who felt that "interns" lacked the background and stature to make suggestions for change in classroom practices on behalf of given pupils. The recommendation was made that the label "intern" be dropped and that individuals participating in this program be referred to as school counselors or intern counselors *and not* counselor interns.

2. Preparation of the local school counselor who supervises intern counselors is often left to chance. Some institutions provide for a brief orientation of cooperating local supervisors but this important process is not approached in any coordinated manner by the participating counselor education programs. There is a definite need to examine the role to be played by the supervising school counselor in the internship program and to develop a systematic approach to preparing individuals for this responsibility.

The second workshop. The 66 participants at this workshop included intern school counselors, their local school and university supervisors, and staff members of the WDPI. The major objectives of the workshop were (a) to provide a training experience for local school supervisors of intern counselors, and (b) to discuss expectations for the internship experiences with the interns and their local and university supervisors in order to realize more unanimity between the internships. This workshop was planned as a follow-up to recommendations made at the first workshop regarding preparation of individuals for the supervisory function in the internship program.

The methodology utilized in this second workshop also centered on small group processes. The first group assignments were made on a homogeneous basis (e.g., intern counselors, cooperating local school counselors, principals). The second, and final, groupings were made on a heterogeneous basis with each group consisting of five or six members each representative of interns, local superviors and counselor educators. Worksheets designed to structure the small group sessions were distributed at the first meeting. Summarizations of the first groups' worksheets were presented for reaction during the second small group meetings. The reactions to these were reported and discussed during a meeting of all participants at the end of the day. The discussions at this point centered primarily on the second objective, (b), of the workshop.

Dilley (1972a) summarizes the major recommendations of the workshop as:

1. Counselor interns should be referred to as counselors and treated as first year professionals. Interns indicated that the name intern caused teachers and students to view them as temporary help, undergraduate, naive student teachers, and second class citizens with whom only trivial matters could be discussed.

2. Supervisors said they could function more effectively if referred to as cooperating counselors, consultants, resource persons, or advisors. They felt the word *supervisor* created an authoritarian relationship between them and their interns. Name changes may seem minor, but the names symbolize changes in expectations that could mean better performance from both parties.

3. A performance contract was suggested by the interns to help solve problems created by isolation and uncertainties. The contract would be agreed to by the university, administrator of the school district or his representative, cooperating counselor (supervisor), and the counselor (intern). The contract would specify professional duties, employer requirements, education and certification requirements and procedures for implementing these in detail clarifying exactly what the counselor

(intern) had to do to warrant recommendation by the school district, to complete the educational requirements of the university, and to receive certification as a school counselor [pp. 61-62].

The third workshop. The 52 participants included 32 intern school counselors, six counselor educators, three WDPI staff members and 11 cooperating counselors (local school counselors serving as supervisors of intern counselors). The primary objective of this workshop was to assess the viability of selected aspects (principally the policies being followed in the administration of the program) of the internship alternative in light of the first four years of experience with the program.

As in the earlier workshops, the format included substantial use of small group discussion/reaction processes followed by large group report back sessions to address the identified aspects of the internship program. Assignments to the small groups were made on homogeneous and heterogeneous bases by work setting — intern counselors, local supervisors (cooperating counselors), etc. Each small group was asked to address itself to seven questions which were listed on a handout given participants. These questions were designed to lend structure to the small group meetings and to obtain reaction to specific variables concerning the operation of the internship alternative.

The reactions of the workshop participants supported the continuance of the policies which were developed for the internship program by the WDPI and the five participating universities. The following additional recommendations were put forth for the first time:

1. Stronger "control" should be exercised by the WDPI and the supporting university over the assignments given to the intern and the intern's salary. Cooperating local school counselors should also be paid for their responsibilities with regard to the intern.
2. The internship program should be required of all individuals preparing to become school counselors regardless of the teaching experience factor.
3. The WDPI should prepare descriptive materials regarding the program, and including its expectations for experiences to be provided the intern, for distribution to local schools *before* an internship begins.

In summary. The three workshops served to provide a forum—albeit more of a chance happenstance rather than any purposeful design—to monitor, examine and evaluate many facets of the internship in school counseling program. For the first time since the inception in 1968 of this alternative program for the preparation of school counselors, the principal participants—the interns, their local and university supervisors, and WDPI personnel—were brought together under conditions in

which they could examine at sufficient length any and all of the factors conducive to or working against the success of the program.

The results of discussions at the workshops indicate clearly that in spite of stated guidelines for the conduct of the internship program that a wide range and quality of experiences were actually being provided. Some internships were operated within the stated counselor-pupil ratio of not more than 1/200; others experienced substantially higher pupil loads. Some interns were provided with frequent supervision while others received virtually none. Some universities provided ample seminar experiences while others approached this aspect in a cursory manner at best. The expressed concerns seem to reflect, at least in part, the fact that each of the five participating universities took a different approach to establishing their internship program while the interns themselves desired a closer adherance to the policies which had been defined for the operation of this alternative in school counselor preparation. This seems more reflective of individual experiences rather than the general rule.

The workshops assisted in identifying the key factors inhibiting satisfactory internship experiences (load, supervision, salary, facilities, etc.) as well as those seeming to assure more successful experiences (supervision, seminars, load, pre-service, etc.). This was accomplished by a thorough examination of the issues and concerns which in turn faciliatated the development and refinement of the policies and guidelines which now govern the operation of the internship alternative in the state. The discussions and recommendations put forth at these workshops provided a significant means of monitoring the development of the internship program.

Conclusions

> Should lack of a teaching credential and paid teaching experience bar from school counseling those who may be otherwise qualified to counsel students and consult with staff [Wrenn, 1962, p. 170]?

The purpose of this chapter has been to present the Wisconsin model on the internship in school counseling as an alternative to teaching experience and teacher preparation. The model was developed to examine the question, "Does the internship in school counseling provide a satisfactory vehicle for successful entry into the school counseling and guidance services field?" Also presented in this chapter were the procedures followed by the WDPI and the cooperating universities in implementing and conducting the internship alternative.

The following conclusions are offered as a result of Wisconsin's experimentation:

1. The internship in school counseling program provides a viable alternative to the teaching prerequisites in the preparation of school counselors. This

conclusion is based upon (a) the demonstrated employability of the ICs involved in this study; (b) the practicum performance of ICs compared to TCs; and, (c) the graduate GPAs earned by ICs as compared to TCs.

2. The teaching requirements in school counselor certification exist without empirical justification having evolved in a manner more analogous to fraternity ritual than scientific reasoning. The likelihood, however, of these requirements quickly disappearing in the face of mounting evidence pointing to their fallacy is remote.

3. The observation that counselors who have been teachers are more likely to be perceived by teachers as "one of them" appears to be a myth. The review of the literature suggests that teachers who become school counselors are more likely to be seen by their former peers as members of the administration. Teachers did not report any significant problems in relating to the ICs—the lack of teaching experience has not been found to be handicapping working relationships between the ICs and teachers.

4. If the traditional teaching requirements are not appropriate for all individuals seeking to become school counselors, this phenomenon may also be true in the case of a few other sacrosanct areas such as school administration.

5. The value of school based experiences in the preparation of school counselors cannot be questioned. What may be at issue is whether one must first be prepared as a teacher and then follow this with "X" years of actual teaching experience in order to be a "successful" school counselor.

6. Individuals who must complete the internship program to earn counselor certification in the state demonstrate a greater commitment to the profession than do TCs. The only positions open to ICs in the public schools of the state are as counselors or in administrative positions directly related to guidance and counseling or pupil personnel programs. The IC is more likely than the TC to go right from his or her preparation program to a position as a school counselor reflective of the individual's commitment to a career choice of counseling.

7. The internship alternative is, at least in Wisconsin, a more economical method of preparing school counselors. Experience to date has shown a significantly higher percentage of ICs (71.59%) working as school counselors as compared to TCs (38.83%).

8. There has been in the placement of ICs occasional substantive deviation from the policies which govern this alternative. Examples include placing interns in settings without qualified local supervision, high counselor/pupil ratios, unsalaried positions, etc. This does not seem to have seriously

jeopardized the program as evidenced by the fact that all but two of 117 individuals beginning an internship (1968-1973) completed the program and only one mid-year relocation of an intern was necessary. However, the results of the WDPI efforts to monitor this alternative indicate clearly that exceptions to the policies should continue to be quite limited if the program is to be successful.

The answer, at least for Wisconsin, to Wrenn's (1962) question as quoted above is "No." Dilley's (1972c) conclusion serves well to summarize:

> From the comments of administrators who have previously experienced both teacher and non-teacher counselors, it is clear that it is the person and not the teaching experience that matters [p. 133].

Implications for School Counselor Education

The 1968 change in Wisconsin's school counselor certification standards provided this opportunity to test the teaching experience variables in the preparation of persons for the counseling and guidance services field. Through 1972-73, five of the state's nine universities offering counselor education programs had developed the internship alternative. Continuity between the various institutional approaches to the internship has been facilitated through the WDPI.

Included in this chapter has been an examination of the relationships between the WDPI and the participating universities in establishing the internship alternative in school counselor preparation. The cooperative working relationships between these parties helped to nurture the concept and has been instrumental in the effective implementation of a unique approach to adequately test the teaching variables in counselor certification.

As a result, implications for school counselor education in Wisconsin have been identified (included are several issues affecting the internship program which as yet remain unresolved). Many of these also suggest areas of the program in need of further research. The implications include:

1. The terms "supervisor" and "supervisory relationships" as they apply to the internship settings have not been adequately defined. Also, experience to date has shown a definite need for some type of formalized preparation for those school counselors who serve as the local supervisors (if that is indeed the appropriate term) for the intern counselors.
2. Although the internship in school counseling program was established as an alternate route to school counselor certification in Wisconsin, some

individuals completing the program have moved from the state and requested school counselor certification elsewhere. In most instances, these states still require either or both eligibility for a teaching credential and teaching experience. While students entering the internship have been cautioned that no guarantees could be made regarding school counselor certification in other states upon completion of this alternate program, the WDPI has attempted to assist individuals who leave the state in obtaining counselor certification elsewhere. This procedure usually involves correspondence between the directors of teacher certification of the two states.

To date, this has been the experience of WDPI concerning this issue:

2.1 Two states (Maryland and Washington) have issued school counselor certification to internship prepared counselors not eligible to teach. These states accepted confirmation by the WDPI of the individuals' eligibility for school counselor certification in Wisconsin.

2.2 One state agreed prior to the initiation of an internship placement in its state to accept this experience in lieu of its teacher certification and experience requirements. However, during the period of the internship a new state superintendent of public instruction was elected resulting in new individuals occupying the state education office and the agreement to waive the teaching certification, etc., requirements was withdrawn.

2.3 In another state which still requires eligibility for a teaching credential as a prerequisite to counselor certification, an internship prepared counselor was initially denied a school counselor credential. However, this state subsequently issued a "temporary" two-year counselor's certificate after correspondence and consultation with the WDPI. A condition for further counselor certification in this particular case will be for the individual to obtain teaching certification.

While the number of states no longer specifying eligibility for teacher certification and/or teaching experience as the only route to school counselor certification has grown to at least 17, the Wisconsin alternative can still only assure certification in Wisconsin upon successful completion of this alternate program for the non-teacher. Further, individuals without prior teaching experience and eligibility for teacher certification in Wisconsin can only earn school counselor certification in the state by completion of the internship alternative through one of six universities in the state which are WDPI approved to conduct the internship. The implication for counselor education and preparation involves one of reciprocity in school counselor certification between the state education agencies.

3. The counselor education institutions should conduct a cost analysis for the counselor internship program. The question seems to be, "How does the cost of training school counselors via the internship method compare with the more traditional teaching qualification and/or experience approach?" There can be little doubt that an internship program requires increased university support in terms of expenditures of staff time and energies. The number of interns which each institution can reasonably be expected to train and place annually is limited and costly. It remains now for the approved counselor education programs conducting internships to complete their institutional studies to evaluate this factor.

4. The inclusion of the internship alternative in an institution's counselor education program suggests that differences will exist in the preparation of ICs as compared to TCs. Several questions arise which perhaps should be addressed at the institutional level. These include: "How has having the internship program affected the TCs' program?" "What identifiable side effects can be noted?" "How has the overall counselor education program changed?" "Has the selection of TCs improved?" "What have been the secondary effects of the ICs program?"

5. While some research on the internship program has been carried out by the participating universities, it seems clear that the emphasis on evaluation should continue. Such future investigation, on an institutional basis to follow-up graduates of the program, might be especially helpful if it were to focus on a study of possible differences in the roles of ICs during their internships in comparison to the roles of first year TCs. The suspicion is that in spite of the existence of agreed upon policies for the conduct of the internship alternative not much variation actually exists in the roles fulfilled by these two groups. The latitude between the internship programs established by the participating universities contributes to this in many ways. It seems that more must be done to identify those specific experiences in the internship which contribute most as "substitutes" to teaching experience and to provide greater assurance that ICs experience these and demonstrate the related competencies and knowledge.

6. As implied in two of the three institutional studies reported in this Chapter, the annual generation of adequate internship sites is a serious problem to the participating universities. The school districts which provide internships often hire the ICs as full-time school counselors. The success of the program actually increases the cost factors for the universities and results in much annual searching for new sites (the number of intern counselors placed each year has ranged between 50 and 55 in the past two years). The participating universities and the WDPI will have to give closer attention to the issues surrounding this matter. The related questions having implications are: "Is

there an obligation to fully qualified school counselors to 'protect' incumbent positions from being filled by interns?" and "As the demand for elementary school counselors increases while the supply of such qualified persons is limited should the local supervisory requirements for internships be relaxed in order to provide more internship sites at this level?"

7. The question of remuneration for school counselors who serve as supervisors of ICs should be studied by the universities. At present, a stipend of $300.00 per year is recommended for the local supervisor. Few individuals apparently receive pay for supervising ICs. In light of the fact that most local supervisors of teacher interns receive pay for this type of responsibility and considering the growth of the internship in school counseling program, it appears that this issue should be resolved as quickly as possible.

8. Since the Wisconsin internship program has been shown to provide a viable alternative to the teaching experience requirements in school counselor certification, it seems important for the university participants and the WDPI to disseminate information concerning the matter to other counselor educators and SEAs. The state has provided an adequate testing of this issue and perhaps the findings will encourage other states to incorporate the alternative into their certification standards. Although in retrospect his observation was premature, Rossberg's (1963) statement serves to emphasize the timeliness of this implication:

> . . . there are many in the field of counselor education who are not convinced that teaching experience is the *sine qua non* of counselor preparation and that a substantial number of counselor educators and supervisors are apparently willing to experiment [p. 124].

APPENDICES

Appendix A

(Copy)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Bureau for Pupil Services
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

SURVEY OF INTERN SCHOOL COUNSELORS

Instructions: Please complete one of these forms for each person who has finished, or is presently enrolled in, an internship in school counseling through your institution.

1. Name of intern counselor_____ 2. Sex: M___ F___
3. Present mailing address _____
4. Age at time of internship (nearest birthday) _____
5. University sponsoring internship _____
6. Undergraduate degree _____
7. Undergraduate major _____
8. Undergraduate degree from _____
9. Eligible for a Wisconsin teacher credential? Yes_____ No_____
10. Previous teaching experience? Yes_____No_____
    If "yes" please indicate number of years and describe teaching assignment/s. (Do not count practice and/or intern teaching.)
11. Describe all employment experience/s (paid) outside of elementary and/or secondary education prior to internship and beyond high school graduation:

(continued)

12. Location of internship _____ 13. Dates of internship _____

14. Grades regularly worked with during internship:

K___1___2___3___4___5___6___7___8___9___10___11___12___

15. Presently employed as a school counselor? Yes_____No_____
If "no", please explain employment status.

16. If employed as school counselor, where? _____

17. If employed as school counselor, indicate grades regularly worked with:

K___1___2___3___4___5___6___7___8___9___10___11___12___

Appendix B

(Copy)

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Department of Public Instruction

Coordinators, Internships in School Counseling

Dr. Josiah Dilley - University of Wisconsin, Madison
Dr. Lawrence Blum - University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Dr. Robert Havens - University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh
Dr. Perry Rockwell - University of Wisconsin, Platteville
Dr. Michael Ritland - University of Wisconsin-Stout (Menomonie)

SURVEY OF SELECTED FACTORS OF THE WISCONSIN INTERNSHIP IN SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM (UNDERGRADUATE GPA AND PLACEMENT)

This questionnaire is a part of the Department's continuing study of various aspects of the internship in school counseling program. A conference will be scheduled with you on your campus by William Erpenbach to discuss this questionnaire.

Your assistance in providing this information will be appreciated. The results will be shared with you. No attempt will be made to evaluate or otherwise compare individual institutional programs or efforts with the data which are collected.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete one of these questionnaires *for each student* who began studies at your institution leading to school counselor certification in Wisconsin during the period first semester 1967 through first semester 1971 inclusive. Please return the completed questionnaires *not later than June 15, 1973* to

(continued)

William Erpenbach
Consultant, Counseling and
Guidance Services
Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

The collected data will be pooled and all information will be treated with strict confidence.

1. Institution _____
2. Student's Name _____ 3. Sex _____
4. Term Entered Program _____ 5. Age at Program Entry _____
6. Undergraduate GPA *(based on a 4 point scale)* _____
7. Undergraduate Major _____
8. Eligible for Wisconsin Teaching Credential? _____
9. Previous Elementary or Secondary School Teaching Experience? _____
10. If "Yes," how many years? _____
11. Participant in Wisconsin Internship in School Counseling Program? _____
12. If "Yes," when was Internship completed? _____
13. Grade in Practicum _____ 14. Practicum Credits *(semester hours)* _____

Complete items 15 through 18 only for those students who have completed your school counselor preparation program.

15. Graduate GPA *(4 point scale)* _____
16. Date Completed Program _____
17. First Full-time Position After Completing Program _____
18. Present Position _____
19. Comments:

LIST OF REFERENCES

List of References

American Personnel and Guidance Association. Professional training, licensing and certification. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1958, 37, 162-166.

American Personnel and Guidance Association. Standards for the preparation of school counselors. A statement of policy. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1961, 40, 402-407.

American Personnel and Guidance Association. A statement of policy. The counselor: Professional preparation and role. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1963, 480-485.

American Personnel and Guidance Association. The counselor: Professional preparation and role. A statement of policy. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1964, 42, 536-541.

American Psychological Association. The scope and standards of preparation in psychology for school counselors. *American Psychologist*, 1962, 17, 149-152.

American School Counselor Association. Preparation, training and certification standards of school counselors. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, February 1973.

Antenen, W.W. & Lister, J.L. Counselor behavior as a function of age and teaching experience. *The Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education*, 1967, 6, 1-5.

Arbuckle, D.S. The conflicting functions of the school counselor. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1961, 1, 54-59.

Arbuckle, D.S. The school counselor—Reality or illusion. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1963, 2, 54-65.

Arbuckle, D.S. Counselor, social worker, psychologist: Let's "ecumenicalize." *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, 45, 532-538. (a)

Arbuckle, D.S. The school counselor: Educator, psychologist, or what? *The School Counselor*, 1967, 14, 133-137. (b)

Arbuckle, D.S. Current issues in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1968, 7, 244-252.

ASCA explores certification. *Guidepost* (A newsletter of the American Personnel and Guidance Association), 1973, 15, (14), 1.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. Standards for the preparation of secondary school counselors—1967. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, 46, 97-106.

Aubrey, R.F. Misapplication of therapy models to school counseling. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1969, 48, 273-278.

Barry, R. & Wolf, B. *An epitaph for vocational guidance.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Bixler, R.H. The changing world of the counselor II: Training for the unknown. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1963, 2, 168-175.

Blocher, D. Can the counselor function as an effective agent of change? *The School Counselor*, 1966, 13, 202-205.

Boller, J.D. Teaching experience for counselors: Is it still relevant? *Minnesota Pupil Personnel Services Bulletin* (Minnesota Department of Education), Winter 1970-71, 3-5.

Boller, J.D. Counselor certification: Who still needs teaching experience? *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1972, 50, 388-391.

Brewster, R.E. *Guidance workers certification requirements.* (Bulletin No. 22) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

Brown, D. & Peterson, B.H. The teaching experience prerequisite for the school counselor: An examination. *The School Counselor, 1968, 16, 17-20.*

California resolutions. The School Counselor, 1962, 9, 156.

Campbell, R.E. Counselor personality and background and his interview subrole behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1962, 9, 329-334.

Carroll, M.A. & Tyson, J.C. Is the counselor-teacher the answer after all? *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1969, 8, 303-307.

Carson, G.W. A self-perception: The counselor is a teacher (in "reader reflections"). *The School Counselor*, 1971, 18, 319-321.

Cohen, N.K. Must teaching be a prerequisite for guidance? *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1961, 1, 69-71.

Dilley, J. Wisconsin school counselor internship program evaluation underway. *Guidelines for Pupil Services.* Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1972, 10, 61-62. (a)

Dilley, J. Helping counselors locate success. *Guidelines for Pupil Services.* Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1972, 10, 111-112. (b)

Dilley, J. Counselors without teaching experience can be successful (in "on the scene"). *The School Counselor*, 1972, 20, 132-133. (c)

Dilley, J., Foster, W. & Bowers, I. Rated effectiveness of counselors without teaching experience. *Counselor Education and Supervison*, 1973, 13, 24-29.

Dudley, G. & Ruff, E.E. School counselor certification: A study of current requirements. *The School Counselor*, 1970, 17, 304-311.

Dugan, W.E. The impact of N.D.E.A. upon counselor preparation. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1960, 39, 37-40.

Dugan, W. E. Critical concerns of counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1961, 0, 5-11.

Dugan, W. E. Guidance in the 1970's. *The School Counselor*, 1963, 10, 96-100.

Duties, standards and qualifications for counselors. (Bulletin Misc. 3314-1) Washington, D. C.: Federal Security Agency - Office of Education, Division of Vocational Education, February 1949.

Eckerson, L.O. & Smith, H. M. Guidance in elementary schools: Successful practices. *School Life*, 1962, 44, 16-19.

Eckerson, L. O. & Smith, H. M. (Eds.). *Scope of pupil personnel services.* (FS 5.223:23045) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Erpenbach, W. (Ed.) *Internships in school counseling: A Wisconsin alternative.* Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, September 1973.

Farwell, G. F. The role of the school counselor. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1961, 1, 40-43.

Farwell, G. F. Counselors themselves—An issue. *The School Counselor*, 1962, 10, 27-31.

Fitzgerald, P. W. The professional role of school counselors. In J. W. Loughary (Ed.), *Counseling, a growing profession.* Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

Fredrickson, R. H. & Pippert, R. R. Teaching experience in the employment of school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1964, 4, 24-27.

Frederickson, R. H. & Pippert, R. R. A non-curmudgeonly reaction (in "ACES corner"). *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1966, 5, 168.

Gazda, G. M. New trends in counseling. *The School Counselor*, 1965, 13, 14-18.

Gazda, G. M., Clements, H. M., Duncan, J. A. & Martin, C. L. Response sets of neophyte counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1967, 6, 151-156.

Grasmick, G. L. Five case studies of guidance interns at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. Unpublished master's research paper, University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1973.

Graybeal, W. S. *Teacher supply and demand in public schools, 1972.* (Research report 1972-R8) Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1972.

Grigsby, D.A. *The effects of student teaching upon attitudinal characteristics considered basic for effective counselors.* (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1970, No. 71-18, 654.

Guilford, J. P. *Fundamental statistics in psychology and education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Havens, R. I. *A school counselor education program for persons without teaching experience.* A research report related to U.S. Office of Education, Education Professions Development Act Grant Nos. OEG-0-9-590570-2036-721, OEG-0-70-2033-(721) and (725). Oshkosh: University of Wisconsin, December 1972.

Hays, D. G. Counselor moratorium (in "what do you think?"). *Guidepost* (A newsletter of the American Personnel and Guidance Association), 1973, 15 (12), 2.

Herr, E. L. National perspectives on state guidance office functions. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1971, 10, 209-218.

Hill, G. E. The selection of school counselors. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1961, 39, 355-360.

Hill, G. E. *Staffing guidance programs.* In S. C. Stone & B. Shertzer (Eds.), Guidance Monograph Series. *Series I: Organization and administration.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968.

Hobbs, N. The compleat counselor. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1958, 36, 594-602.

Hopke, W. E. How are school counselors counseling? *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1964, 3, 162-165.

Hopper, G., Brown, D. & Pfister, S. Ratings by counselors without teaching experience and their principals regarding performance of guidance functions. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1970, 9, 99-105.

Houghton, H. W. & Bowman, C. W. *Counselor education . . . A progress report on standards.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Counselor Education and Supervision and American School Counselor Association, 1962.

Hoyt, K. B. What the school has a right to expect of its counselor. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1961, 40, 129-133.

Hoyt, K. B. Guidance: A constellation of services. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1962, 40, 690-697.

Hoyt, K. B. Should school counselors have taught? A research proposal. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1963, 2, 126-129.

Hudson, G. R. Counselors need teaching experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1961, 0, 24-25.

Huff, V. E. The millstone of teaching experience (a drama in one act) (in "letters ...and comments"). *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1965, 44, 193-194.

Humes, C. W., Jr. Teaching experience a must for counselors? *Idaho Guidance News & Views* (Idaho Department of Education), 1970, 12 (1), 11-14.

Humes, C. W., Jr. Are counselors part of pupil personnel services (in "reader reflections")? *The School Counselor,* 1971,18, 316-319.

Hutson, P. W. Another "position" paper. *Counselor Education and Supervison,* 1962, 2, 40-44. (a)

Hutson, P. W. Deriving counselor education from activity analysis. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1962, 1, 132-140. (b)

Hutson, P. W. Views on counselor preparation. *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals,* 1963, 47, 19-26.

Hutson, P. W. Counselors need teaching experience (in "letters and comments"). *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1964, 42, 819-820.

Isaksen, H. L. Training and professionalization of the school counselor. In A. Stiller (Ed.), *School counseling 1967 a view from within.* Washington, D. C.: American School Counselor Association, 1967.

Johnson, V. B. Implications of the Wrenn report for state supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1962, 2, 27-34.

Johnson, W.F. Position paper—Curriculum. In H.W. Houghton & C.W. Bowman (Eds.), *Counselor education . . . A progress report on standards.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Counselor Education and Supervision and American School Counselor Association, 1962.

Kehas, C.D. Toward a redefinition of education: A new framework for counseling in education. In B. Shertzer, & S.C. Stone (Eds.), *Introduction to guidance: Selected readings.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1970.

Kehas, C.D., & Morse, J. L. Perceptions in role change from teacher to counselor. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1970, 9, 248-258.

Kehas, C.D. & Morse, J. L. Perceptions in role change from teacher to counselor: Intra-role conflict and motivation for change. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1971, 10, 200-208.

Keppers, G.L. National certification of counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1965, 4, 202-207.

Kinsey, S. Student rights: A program for counselors. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1971, 50, 52-57.

Kinzer, J.R. The educated counselor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 1961, 8, 14-16.

Klopf, G.J. & Cohen, N.K. The impact of NDEA counseling and guidance institutes on the professional education of school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1962, 1, 151-161.

Klopf, G.J., Hewson, C.S., Love, V.H., Gummere, R.M. & Merritt, R.T. *Interns in guidance.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Knock, G.H. & Cody, J.J. Student-centeredness: A comparison of counselor candidates, teachers and administrators. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1967, 6, 114-119.

Kobrin, E.R. Anti-moratorium stance (in "what do you think?"). *Guidepost* (A newsletter of the American Personnel and Guidance Association), February 23, 1973, 15 (11), 2.

Lawlor, P. ASCA membership study reveals trends. *ASCA Newsletter,* 1968, 6 (1), 4.

Lister, J.L. Teaching experience necessary for counselors? *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals,* 1969, 53, 39-53.

Lister, J.L. & Northrop, J.C. Teaching experience for counselors: A review of the evidence. *The Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education,* 1970, 9, 8-16.

Lloyd, D.O. Counselor and counselor trainer attitudes toward counselor certification in the United States. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1962, 40, 791-798.

Lloyd-Jones, E. Implications of the Wrenn report for counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1962, 2, 17-25.

Loughary, J.W. (Ed.) *Counseling, a growing profession.* Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

Martinson, W.D. & Winborn, B.B. Are we our own worst enemies? *The School Counselor,* 1964, 12, 85-88.

Mathewson, R.H. Graduate training for school counselors. *Occupations* (now, *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*), 1962, 30, 335-339.

Maynard, P.E. Counselor moratorium (in "what do you think?"). *Guidepost* (A newsletter of the American Personnel and Guidance Association), 1973, 15, (12), 2.

Mazer, G.E., Severson, J.L., Axman, A.A., & Ludington, K.A. The effects of teaching background on school counselor practices. *The Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education,* 1965, 4, 81-84.

McCreary, W.H. ACES corner—Counselor preparation in California. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1969, 8, 143-145.

McCreary, W.H. & Miller, G. Elementary school counselors in California. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1966, 44, 494-498.

McCully, C.H. A rationale for counselor certification. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1961, 1, 3-9.

McCully, C.H. The school counselor: Strategy for professionalization. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1962, 40, 681-689.

McDo gall, W.P. & Reitan, H.M. The elementary counselor as perceived by elementary principals. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1963, 42, 348-354.

Meeks, A. Dimensions of elementary school guidance. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling,* 1967, 1, 163-187.

Merrill, I.P., Lister, J.L. & Antenen, W.W. Teaching experience and counselor behavior: A further examination. *The Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education,* 1968, 6, 69-77.

Miller, C.H. Quality in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1962, 1, 124-130.

Moore, G.D. A negative view toward therapeutic counseling in the public schools. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1961, 1, 60-68.

Moses, H.A. Rights vs. obligations (in "reader reflections"). *The School Counselor,* 1967, 15, 60-62.

Myrick, R.D. Editorial—too many counselors: Fact or fiction? *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling,* 1973, 7, 254-255.

New directions in counselor education. *Guidepost* (A newsletter of the American Personnel and Guidance Association), 1971, 14, (2), 1-2.

Nissman, B. & Stamm, M. The case for elementary guidance (in "reader reflections"). *The School Counselor*, 1970, 17, 165-166.

Noble, F.C. The two-year graduate program in counselor education: A re-examination. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1965, 4, 160-162.

Noble, F.C. Why don't counselors counsel? *The School Counselor*, 1968, 16, 94-98.

Norfleet, M. & Vanhoose, J. The student teacher and the guidance viewpoint. *The School Counselor*, 1965, 12, 214-217.

Norris, W. More than a decade of training guidance and personnel workers. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1960, 39, 287-291.

Northrup, J.C. *Verbal interview behavior of a selected group of experienced practicing counselors.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1970.

Nugent, F.A. A rationale against teaching experience for school counselors. *The School Counselor*, 1966, 13, 213-215.

O'Brien, C., Bailey, R.E. & Fitzgerald, P.W. School counseling internship: An examination. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1966, 6, 44-49.

Odell, C.E. Change in a developing field. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1973, 52, 141-144.

Office of Education. *The national defense counseling and guidance training institutes program.* (OE-25001) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, September 1959.

Office of Education. *The national defense counseling and guidance training institutes program.* (OE-25002) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, undated.

Olejniczak, B. Grass roots revisited—Focus on Monona Grove's Cathy DuPont. *Communique* (The Wisconsin Personnel and Guidance Association), 1972, 4 (2), 1-4.

Olsen, L.C. Success for new counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1963, 10, 350-355.

Paulson, B.B. Riposte (in reaction to the article, Counselor, social worker, psychologist: Let's "ecumenicalize," by D.S. Arbuckle). *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, 45, 539-540.

Payne, J.W. Impact of the ASCA statement of counselor role. *The School Counselor*, 1965, 12, 136-139.

Pedone, R.J. *The availability of pupil personnel specialists to public schools, fall 1968.* (HE 5.220:20193) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Peters, H.J. & Thompson, C.L. School superintendents view counselor preparation. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1968, 7, 379-386.

Peters, H.J. & Van Atta, R.E. Differential premises in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1961, 1, 36-39.

Peterson, B.H. & Brown, D. Does teaching experience matter? *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1968, 46, 893-897.

Pierson, G.A. Aesop and the school counselor. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1954, 32, 326-329.

Plattor, S.D. A curmudgeonly reaction (in "ACES corner"). *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1965, 5, 50-51.

Port Chester Public Schools. Guidelines for internships in the Port Chester schools. Unpublished report. Port Chester, New York: Department of Pupil Personnel Services, 1969.

Ricker, G.A Must counselors have taught? *The School Counselor,* 1969, 17, 40-46.

Rochester, D.E. & Cottingham, H.F. Is teaching experience necessary? Counselor educators speak out. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1966, 5, 175-181.

Rogers, M.P. Teaching or training for counselors (in "reader reflections")? *The School Counselor,* 1970, 18, 7-9.

Rossberg, R.H. To teach or not to teach: Is that the question? *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 1963, 2, 121-125.

Sexton, J. M. A reaction to the ASCA statement of policy for secondary school counselors. *The School Counselor,* 1965, 12, 132-135.

Shertzer, B. & Stone, S.C. *Fundamentals of guidance.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1966.

Shertzer, B. & Stone, S. C. *Fundamentals of counseling.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1968.

State news. *ASCA Newsletter,* 1973, 10 (3), 4.

Stevenson, J. B. Why internships? Unpublished manuscript. Menomonie, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin - Stout, January 1968.

Stewart, L. H. Teachers and counselors look at students: Some implications for guidance practice. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 1957, 35, 565-568.

Stewart, L. H. Comments (in reaction to the article, What the school has a right to expect of its counselor, by K. B. Hoyt). *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1961, 40, 133-134.

Stewart, L., Norem, G., Polmantier, R. R., & Saum, J. Professional training licensing and certification (in "association activities"). *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1958, 37, 162-166.

Stewart, L. H. & Warnath, C. F. *The counselor and society: A cultural approach*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1965.

Stiller, A. & Gannon, F. B. Differential perceptions of counselor role: Implications for program modification. *The School Counselor*, 1968, 15, 198-203.

Stripling, R. O. & Lane, D. Guidance services. In Eckerson, L. O. & Smith, H. M., *Scope of pupil personnel services*. (FS 5.223:23045) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Stubbins, J. The politics of counseling. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1970, 48, 611-618.

Swan, B. B. The back door approach to becoming a counselor. *The Clearing House*, 1965, 40, 70-73.

Swann, M. H. The changing role of the school counselor. *The School Counselor*, 1963, 11, 94-101.

Thompson, J. M. Current issues and problems in elementary school guidance. *The School Counselor*, 1965, 13, 77-81.

Tooker, E. D. Counselor role: Counselor training. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1957, 36, 263-267.

Trow, W. C. Diagnostician, EdS, and PhD programs for school psychologists in Michigan (in "comment"). *American Psychologist*, 1961, 16, 84-85.

Van Hoose, W. H. & Vafakas, C. M. Status of guidance and counseling in the elementary school. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1968, 46, 536-539.

Venn, K. Should we condemn current guidance practices? A practitioner's evaluation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1964, 3, 158-161.

Venn, K. Let's not ecumenicalize (in "letters and comments"). *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1967, 46, 73.

Warnath, C. F. The school counselor as institutional agent. *The School Counselor*, 1973, 20, 202-208.

Wehrly, B. Elementary school counselor preparation programs in the United States. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 1970, 4, 203-210.

Weitz, H. The role of the guidance worker in the schools. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1958, 37, 266-272.

Whetstone, B. D. Personality differences between selected counselors and effective teachers. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1965, 43, 886-890.

White, A. J. & Forrest, D. V. No-teaching experience in counselor education: Discussion and a model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1968, 7, 340-347.

Wilson, L. E. ACES corner—Teaching experience: Counselor and teacher opinions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1969, 8, 148-150.

Winfrey, J. K. Implications of the Wrenn report to the school counselor. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1962, 2, 35-39.

Winkler, P. R. Educational background of Iowa school counselors. *Guidance bulletin* (Official publication of the Iowa Personnel and Guidance Association), 1966, 5, 15-19.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. *Certification standards*. (Bulletin 1809) Madison: 1972.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. *1969 laws of Wisconsin relating to public schools*. Madison: 1969.

Wittmer, J. & Lister, J. L. Teaching experience for counselors: A comparison of former teachers and nonteachers. *The Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education*, 1973, 11, 85-92.

Wittmer, J. & Webster, G. B. The relationship between teaching experience and counselor trainee dogmatism. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1969, 16, 499-504.

Woody, R. H. What kind of counselor moratorium (in "what do you think?") *Guidepost* (A newsletter of the American Personnel and Guidance Association), 1973, 15 (15), 2.

Wrenn, C. G. *The counselor in a changing world*. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1962.

Wrenn, C. G. A second look. In J. W. Loughary (Ed.), *Counseling, a growing profession*. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

Zerface, J. P. & Cox, W. H. School counselors, leave home. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 1971, 49, 371-375.

1800-F74452-76